THEORETICAL AND DISCUSSION JOURNAL OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

NOVEMBER 1964

Marxism Today

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

E. V. ROWSELL — SCIENCE, REVOLUTION AND POLITICS

JAMES KLUGMANN — THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

DISCUSSION:

RAYMOND SOUTHALL — THE QUEST FOR HAPPINESS

JACK LINDSAY — ALIENATION UNDER SOCIALISM

Monthly 2/-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marxism Today

Vol. 8 No. 11

CONTENTS

		page
	Editorial Comments	325
E. V. ROWSELL	**Science, Revolution and Politics**	328
James KLUGMANN	**The First International** ...	339
DISCUSSION:		
Raymond SOUTHALL	**The Quest for Happiness** ...	350
Jack LINDSAY	**Alienation Under Socialism** ...	353

AMONG ARTICLES IN DECEMBER AND FORTHCOMING ISSUES

Martin MILLIGAN	**Marxism and Morality**
Andrew TAYLOR	**Necessity and Chance in Physics**
A. SOHN-RETHEL	**Historical Materialist Theory of Knowledge**
Brian KIRMAN	**Modern Trends in Psychology**
Emile BURNS	**Problems of Inflation**
Frank MCKENNA	**Work-Study and Automation**
John LEWIS	**Sam Beckett and the Decline of Modern Civilisation**
Sam LILLEY Jack LINDSAY	**Galileo**
Jessie KOCMANOVA	**The Socialist Poems of William Morris**
Maurice HOOKHAM	**Marxism, Sociology and Class**

Editor James Klugmann

Editorial Board

Professor J. D. Bernal
Emile Burns
Gabriel Carritt
Maurice Cornforth
Maurice Dobb
John Gollan
Jack Hendy
Arnold Kettle
John Lewis
Frank McKenna
John Mahon
Alan Morton
Professor George Thomson

Editorial Correspondence
James Klugmann
16 King Street, W.C.2

Advertisements
Doris Allison,
above address

Orders and Subscriptions
usual agents or
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Gray's Inn Road,
London, W.C.1

Subscription rates
Six issues 13s. 6d.
Twelve issues 27s.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editorial Comments

The "Escape Clause"

IF anyone wants an epithet for the recent confrontation of parties may we suggest "the escape clause election"? All the suggested reforms were presented in large type by the Labour, Liberal and Tory parties. The condition for obtaining these reforms—namely, that the British monopoly capitalist economy achieved a 4 per cent economic growth —was consistently played down—particularly by the Tories.

Indeed the Prime Minister seemed to think that the economy had already achieved a 4 per cent rate of growth and the only problem was how to maintain it. But in fact the 4 per cent rate was not achieved. The economy has in fact not achieved 3½ per cent, which means that at the height of a boom it was falling about £125 million per annum short of the Neddy target.

Among the sections of British industry that were supposed to make a contribution to the 4 per cent growth rate is the machine tool industry. In the "indicative" plan of the National Economic Development Council the machine tool industry was supposed to grow 50 per cent between 1961 and 1966. In fact output in 1963 was actually 8 per cent lower than 1961 and was no higher than it had been in 1956.

Commenting on this *The Times Review of Industry and Technology* (October 1964) said:

> "It is the one trade which has not shared in current economic boom *and as industrial activity generally has quickened the machine tool makers have reported falling orders*" [our italics].

What about Automation?

Commenting on the need for more being spent on research and development *The Times Review* notes that in a letter to *The Times* recently a correspondent wrote:

> "A British machine-tool manufacturer offered me this year the identical model lathe that he sold me in 1949 and that itself was a pre-war model. When I protested he offered to fit it up with punch tape control. The Germans, the Swiss, the Americans, and even the Russians are way ahead."

Amidst all the talk about "modernisation" one would imagine that the firms concerned with manufacturing scientific equipment and automation equipment would be rushing ahead at a tremendous rate. Although some of them appear to be doing moderately well, they are complaining that not enough British firms are interested. According to *The Times Review*, four leading British instrument firms made the following comments on the attitude of British firms to instrumentation and automation:

> "There is a very large sphere of British industry which is reluctant to recognise the benefits of using measuring and control instruments."
>
> "Nearly all the most advanced instruments we make go behind the Iron Curtain."
>
> "The German steel makers are rather more willing than their British counterparts to instal and use British instruments."
>
> "Our newest instruments sell well in America —but we can hardly sell any of them in Britain."

After indicating how the "iron curtain countries" are successfully tackling these problems *The Times Review* says:

> "The British industry is in the curiously schizophrenic position of being dedicated to a private enterprise economy, and at the same time casting wistful, not to say longing, glances towards the state planning system. Somewhere between the two there should be a workable compromise."

It certainly is wonderful how big business propagandists extol the virtues and efficiencies of "private enterprise", until trouble looms ahead, and then call for state intervention and state handouts to help them out of their difficulties.

Selling out Britain?

The *National Income and Expenditure* blue book for 1964 contains a new table, headed "Gross capital stock at 1958 prices, new". The figures in this table have been taken in some quarters as showing the total value of all fixed capital in Britain. This total comes to £97,000 million.

This is an impressive figure, but unfortunately it is not even an estimate of the present value of anything in Britain. The explanatory notes to the table show that the figures in it do not represent the original cost of any item, nor are they based on original cost less depreciation. They are merely estimates of what the capital value *would be if all*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

existing assets were to be replaced at 1958 prices. So the longer an asset as plant and machinery has been in existence and has therefore declined in value, the greater the gap between its present value and the figure given for it in this table.

The values given are therefore purely mythical, and if the Tories had wanted to sell out Britain at this price they would not have had a bid even from the most generous American tycoon.

Studying the First International

One event of great interest in connection with the centenary of the First International was the holding of a conference at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism in Berlin on September 10th and 11th. The bulk of those present, naturally, were historians and Party workers from the German Democratic Republic, but there were also representatives from the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Poland, France, Britain, Austria, Yugoslavia and Switzerland, most of whom had interesting things to add to the discussion.

The first day was devoted to a general discussion of the historic importance of the International, the part it played in developing the workers' movement in various countries, and especially the role of Marx, who has, as Dr. Gemkow stressed in his opening address, rightly been called "the soul of the International". The work of Marx, in often very difficult circumstances, remains a model which Communists to this very day can hardly study too closely.

Most of the second day was given to discussing the relations of the International to the German workers' movement, an aspect of its history which has perhaps been underestimated in Britain. Here an interesting contribution from Dr. Roger Morgan of the University of Sussex produced some controversy, carried on throughout in the most friendly and positive spirit.

Perhaps the most important new thing, however, to emerge from the Conference, was its light on the influence of the International in east and central Europe. Speakers from Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Austria, in particular, described the great stimulus it gave in those countries. By the end of the 1860's sections were being established with a substantial support among the masses, and, but for the decline of the International in the West, these might have become really important. As it was, though they developed too late to save the International, they survived it to become the germ of future workers' parties. It may well be that the historians of the International up to now have concentrated too exclusively on Britain and western Europe and in future must look further afield.

Another meeting of a different sort was also held at Berlin to celebrate the centenary of the formation of the First International. This was the International Scientific Session, held from September 25th to September 29th under the auspices of the *World Marxist Review*.

International Session at Berlin

Here Marxists from thirty-nine countries met to discuss not only the significance of the I.W.M.A. for the history of the international working class movement, but, above all, the new relation of class forces in the world one hundred years later, and the problems and perspectives facing the working class and the people in the world today.

The first two days were devoted to a number of main reports delivered in plenary session. Walter Ulbricht, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party, spoke on "The First International and the International Communist Movement Today"; J. W. Andropov, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, on "Proletarian Internationalism", and Santiago Carrillo, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Spain, on "The Strength of Creative Marxism".

Jacques Duclos, who had prepared a report on "The Struggle for the Democratisation of the Central and Local State Apparatus", was prevented by ill-health from participating personally, but his report was read to the session. Dr. Emilio Sereni of the Italian Communist Party spoke on "Economics and Politics in the International Working Class Movement", Bachir Hadj Ali of Algeria on "The Struggles of the Peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America for National and Social Liberation", and Dr. Adhikari of the Communist Party of India on "The Fight for Independent National Democracy".

The session then broke into three commissions.

On the last day Comrade Pospelov, Director of the Soviet Institute of Marxism-Leninism, spoke on "The First International and its Place in History" and Alexei Rumyantsev, Editor-in-Chief of the *World Marxist Review*, wound up the discussions.

As can well be imagined a wealth of problems were raised and discussed. Particularly interesting in the commission on Problems of the Advance to Socialism in the Developed Countries, were the discussions on socialist-communist unity, on the fight for democracy, on the relation of the struggle for reforms and the struggle for social revolution, and on the multi-party system under capitalism and socialism.

The *World Marxist Review* will publish the full text of all the reports and interventions in a number of languages, including English. We strongly recommend our readers to obtain and study these extremely important and interesting proceedings.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Death of Professor Potekhin

Professor Ivan Potekhin, who died in Moscow last month, was one of the world's outstanding authorities on Africa. Born into a peasant family in 1903, he began his interest in African studies even before he was twenty. At the time of his death he was head of the Africa Institute of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, Moscow.

He was particularly interested in the development of nations in Africa, and in the course of his life wrote over 100 monographs on the history and ethnography of African countries. Much of his work, regrettably, is not available in English, but his articles on "The Formation of Nations in Africa", and "Against the Revision of Lenin's Conception of Nation" were published in *Marxism Today* in October 1958 and July 1959. His article "Lenin and Africa" appeared in *African Communist*, September 1960. Another more recent essay of his, "Land Relations in African Countries", was published in the same journal in the October-December 1963 issue, as well as in *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, March 1963. The latter journal, published by the Cambridge University Press, has an Editorial Advisory Board composed of authorities on Africa chosen from a number of countries. Professor Potekhin was himself a member of this Board.

Other articles of Professor Potekhin have been published in English, in the Soviet journal *International Affairs*. One of his last contributions was a seventy-two-page booklet entitled *Africa—Ways of Development*, published in English this year by the Nauka Publishing House, Moscow. This work deals with two main current problems—the question of the struggle for economic independence by the new African states; and the question of "African Socialism". On both of these questions Professor Potekhin wrote with great profundity but extreme simplicity of style; and at all times his writing is imbued with a deep sympathy for the struggles and achievements of the African people.

In 1957 Professor Potekhin spent some considerable time in Ghana, studying in particular the growth of classes. Some of the results of this study have been published in essays, but in the last few months he had been hoping that he would have the full work completed and published. It is to be hoped that this will be done, even if the work was incomplete.

Professor Potekhin visited Africa on many occasions, and he was known, respected and loved by many Africans. He impressed by his modesty and humanity as much as by his deep scholarship. His reputation also stood very high among African scholars in Britain and America. He was a notable figure at the International Congresses of Orientalists at Cambridge and in Moscow where his initiative played a big part in the birth of the International Congress of Africanists which met for the first time in Accra, Ghana, in 1962 with some 500 scholars attending.

Unity Theatre in Action

Unity Theatre is presenting Brecht's *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* in December. This is Brecht's last major play, and, in the opinion of many, one of his finest. It will be Unity's sixth major Brecht production, and the second this year—*The Good Woman of Setzuan* playing to packed houses at the St. Pancras Arts Festival last February, and subsequently for a successful run at the theatre. Previously Unity produced *Senora Carrar's Rifles* in 1938, *The Exception and the Rule* in 1957, *Mother Courage* in 1959, *The Visions of Simone Machard* in 1961; these are either British, London or world premières. Since Brecht's death it has not been easy for Unity to get the rights to any of his many so far unperformed plays in English.

This is a pity for in John Willett's words: "Brecht . . . had a liking for unpretentious entertainment (popular songs, thrillers, the music-hall) and found in proletarian acting a simplicity and directness often lacking elsewhere. He knew that it suffered from poverty and a certain lack of surplus energy inevitable to anyone working at another job, which stopped it conveying the heightened emotions and psychological complexities dear to the orthodox thinker. But the essentials were there and deserved our support, and anyway he never rated such 'psychology' very highly." This might be a description of Unity's past work and the long apprenticeship it has served in the working-class popular theatre to qualify for the interpretation of Brecht's plays.

When you consider that Unity unfortunately has to work on a shoestring, and that Brecht plays involve large casts, complex music, settings and costumes, its achievements are even more surprising. Certainly it starts with the advantage of being in sympathy with the content of Brecht's plays, and the theatrical means he used to present them.

Unity considers that Brecht is a writer who has to be fought for. The critics are often either ignorant of Brecht or in downright opposition. This was demonstrated by the West End production of *St. Joan of the Stockyards* which was butchered by the critics, and could not be saved by its financial backers, who could not wait for the build-up of an audience by "word of mouth". It was no coincidence that this happened to be a production unique among British professional productions of Brecht for its integrity and dedication.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Science, Revolution and Politics

E. V. Rowsell

THE need to refurnish our industry with the most modern technology, and the need to expand opportunities in education to provide increasing numbers especially of scientists, engineers and technicians, these related themes are now close to the centre of political discussion in Britain.

There is further an increasing awareness that the changes immediately needed in Britain must be seen as just a part of a whole pattern of world-wide development, a scientific and industrial revolution that will eventually transform the material conditions and the culture for all mankind. Humanity now stands on the brink of scientific advances which hold colossal potentialities for improving man's lot.

Throughout this century there have been optimistic or apprehensive speculations as to the social impact of the continued growth of science. However, until recent years, with some notable exceptions, the interest was expressed mainly in a way which implied that the necessity of grappling with the problems involved would be for future generations. The present interest is quickened by an appreciation that the world is already in a phase of revolutionary change. Problems emerge for discussion that impinge on the shaping of current national policies.

Problems for Britain

In Britain, how much research can we afford? Taking into account the limits of our resources should we take calculated risks and concentrate industrial research and development effort on relatively few projects? Can a general strategy of optimal advance be designed integrating programmes for fundamental and applied science? How can we make science an integral part of our whole culture? Journals are founded to stimulate discussion and investigation on these and allied problems. A study of the history of science can illuminate many of the questions we must now ask and there is a renewal of interest here.

Not so many years ago science as a transforming social force was thought worthy of detailed consideration only by a few. One thinks of pioneers such as Bernal, Blackett, Haldane and Hogben. Their impulse was a deep concern that science should be fully employed and harnessed to serve humanity. Their writings will be an inspiration and a quarry of ideas for years to come. In the 1930's they were already coming to grips with the problems which now become the subject of widespread debate.

This recent spread of interest has every appearance of being here to stay. It is a welcome development. Yet there are serious limitations in the present discussions. Many participants for instance admit their debt to Bernal's pioneering studies. However, the passionate humanism that continues to mark his work in this field, for instance in *World Without War* (1958), finds only a pale reflection generally in contemporary discussions. And it is clear enough that it is not thought fit to make use of Marxism, though Bernal has never made a secret of the fact that this philosophy has always been his guide.

It is only possible to understand and point the way to control the growth and application of science when these are observed together with many other interacting factors in a complex pattern of social change. Advances in technology have a profound impact on the development of society, and the whole process is accelerated when technological innovation is guided by scientific understanding. But it is not a one-sided process. Social and economic pressures operate; some can foster, others frustrate progress. However, one does not see in the present discussions anything like a proper recognition of their strength or significance.

Sometimes they proceed as if fact gathering and an exchange of ideas between eminently reasonable and impartial scientists, engineers and administrators were all that were needed to solve the problems of scientific and industrial advance. And it is assumed that this will automatically bring a general betterment. This is far too comfortable an approach. For example the installation of radically new plant and methods in industry and the programmes of research and development which must pave the way require large capital resources. Whether or not these are made available for any projects in Britain today is largely decided by the few who own and control capital; and the expecta-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of a fairly immediate profit from investment is their guide.

This does not inevitably serve the long term advantages of many with a stake in capitalism. And it would be remarkable indeed if decisions taken on this basis were found to fit a rationally designed programme for continuous technological and industrial advance appropriate to the needs of the whole people and to our national resources. How may the present mechanism for making such decisions be changed to serve the national interest? Could it be done through controls on the movement of private capital? Would extensive government investment in private industry be adequate? Is extensive social ownership of our major industries the only effective way? It is in the nature of the problem that political issues are involved. But no discussion on scientific and economic progress can ignore these questions if it intends to be more than table talk.

Frustrations Under Capitalism

One suspects that many simply do not want to become embroiled in politics. A brave new world is visualised made possible by the advance of science. And there is a confident belief that our century will see it. But the political struggles which must mark the way are not a subject for discussion. The result is that only the most shallow consideration is given to the social and economic movement with which scientific and material advance is inextricably enmeshed.

And it would be wrong to give the impression that everyone shares this vision of our generation building a brave new world. Few who are concerned with the administration of British industry have that degree of optimism. The language of many official reports on our economy, or on the application of science in our industries, would hardly encourage one to believe that a scientific and industrial revolution is being engineered. No doubt there are those who will see these reports as giving a sober and realistic assessment of possibilities for progress. Timid and pessimistic would be a more accurate description. But since it is assumed that the way in which our industries operate is to remain fundamentally unchanged no more can be expected. The following comment on the Machine Tool Industry from a recent N.E.D.C. report[1] illustrates the anarchy our industries must contend with.

> "The industry has stressed that the big fluctuations in demand for machine tools arising from the cyclical movements in manufacturing investment and the associated bunching of orders are a drag on its efficiency. They involve under-used capacity for much of the time and the break-up of skilled labour forces; and overstrain for much of the rest, with frustrated orders, and an increase in imports. Recent developments suggest that just such a cycle is in progress and that the inefficiencies associated with it will be no different from those in the past. Under such conditions the industry's growth objective would seem increasingly unlikely to be realised."

A bold strategy for the initiation of industrial revolution is not going to be conceived, still less carried through, in that kind of economic environment.

There are some nevertheless who are hopeful enough to see a grand application of science to our industries as the latest new medicine that must be tried for the re-invigoration of British capitalism. It has even been implied that computer techniques could be employed to manage its political problems.[2]

In this situation Marxists must restate their position. Marxists stand on the side of those who see a new world being born in which poverty, drudgery, disease, ignorance and squalor will be banished for ever; and agree that the fullest flowering of science will be one of the necessary conditions. And they in fact cannot avoid the conclusion that substantial progress will be made only through challenging the basic tenets of British capitalism.

One purpose of this contribution is to underline again some of the obstacles inherent in British capitalist society that stand in the way of the full and proper use of science.

This is not to say that short of socialism substantial improvements cannot be made. The brighter prospects for expansion in the facilities for higher education are one indication of what can be done. And Marxists have not been slow in insisting that this is a key to general advance.[3] We can be sure that in locating some of the obstacles to scientific and industrial progress that tend to be entrenched in our society we shall find areas where the most far reaching improvements can be made, and some within the framework of capitalism.

Achievements of British Science

However (putting aside for the moment criticisms of the scale and direction of effort), it would be well to note first on the credit side that the *quality* of British science and technology is as good as it ever was.

The fine record of Nobel Prize Awards is ample

[1] N.E.D.C. Report *The Growth of the Economy*, p. 86 (March, 1964).

[2] Sir George Thomson, *New Scientist*, April 9, 1964.

[3] Communist Party Evidence to the Robbins Committee 1961. See also J. D. Bernal, *The Freedom of Necessity*, 1949.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evidence of the excellence of our fundamental research; and this is paralleled by achievements of equal merit in many fields of applied science. The development of nuclear fuelled power stations and jet aircraft in post-war years in Britain demonstrates that, given adequate facilities, engineering talent is comparable with the best in the world. In both instances the development policies adopted have been continuously questioned on economic grounds. But no one will dispute the resourcefulness of the scientists, engineers and technicians involved.

Creative imagination is shown in the development of the hovercraft. In certain agricultural operations it is likely to find a most useful application. Promising experiments are being made using small hovercraft to tow cultivating machinery where the wheels of the normal heavy tractor would damage crops. And there are other technological achievements which have not come so much to public notice. Selecting only one example: our engineers and technicians have solved the problems of mechanised coal-getting for the particularly difficult conditions of British mines.

Research in Britain continues to make an invaluable contribution to medical knowledge. At the Hammersmith post-graduate Medical School a machine has been developed to oxygenate and pump blood around the body, artificially taking over the function of the heart. Such machines manufactured here are now in use in many hospitals around the world and greatly extend the scope for heart surgery.

In the not so distant future it is going to be possible to remove a diseased or seriously damaged organ from a sick person and replace it with a healthy organ (in some cases from a donor recently deceased). Already in the case of kidney transplantation as our hospitals have shown in recent years the surgical problems are solved. And the work of Medawar and his colleagues in the M.R.C. laboratories makes progress in overcoming the difficulties of foreign tissue rejection which for the present makes lasting success precarious in these operations.

What Is and What Could Be

Impressive achievements can be listed but there is little cause for satisfaction when we begin to review the coverage or scale of scientific activity, either in research or in the application of what is already known. And these are the criteria we must use in assessing the adequacy of science in Britain today. How does it compare with the level of activity there *could* be, making full use of all possible resources, human and material? How much is being done to cater for our everyday needs? One thinks of the research needed in so many directions to promote better health, housing and education; and to improve the amenities of social life in town and country. And how does the present level of technological research and its application measure up to Britain's urgently needed industrial progress? Not unexpectedly it is the last point which is given most attention.

Once we have national policies which permit continuous economic expansion and in pursuit of socially desirable objectives there is no question that we have nuclei, in all fields, around which all the needed research support can rapidly grow. That is a fair statement of our present position.

The writing has been on the wall long enough: the poor growth rate of our economy as compared with most other industrialised nations, and our steadily falling share of the world export trade (21 per cent in 1953 to 15.2 per cent in 1962).[4]

If we are to proceed on a new course of economic expansion then technological support will be called for on a greatly increased scale in many industries, and more than a crash research programme if the economy is to gain and then maintain its vitality. Measures are included in the accompanying Table (see page 331) for research and development and the employment of scientists and engineers in steel making, machine tool manufacture and building construction. These are key industries in the sense that they must be highly productive and versatile if our whole economy is to have the base it needs for continuous expansion. It is instructive to compare them with three industries, aircraft, chemicals and electronic apparatus, where levels of applied science are outstandingly high. A comprehensive Table would show that in many other industries (e.g. motor vehicles, textiles, food) the comparable figures were not very different from those listed for these key industries. In fact they would be bracketed along with them as having a low level of support.

Science-Based Industries

No doubt where a branch of industry virtually owes its existence to a developed science then it is easier for all concerned to accept the necessity of a continuing high level of scientifically trained manpower and of research. The chemical industry today is clearly "science-based" (see Table) and with the present knowledge of chemical science and technology it would be inconceivable otherwise. But it was not always so in Britain. The lesson had first to be learned from the example of the German chemical industry, the first to demonstrate at the end of the nineteenth century that science pays. And of course scientific activity in our chemical industry is still responsive to economic stimulation.

[4] *Export Trends*, N.E.D.C. Report (1963).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TABLE

INDUSTRY Establishments with 100 or more employees		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE 1961-62		SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS 1962			
	Total employees	Total £ million	£ per employee	Total	On research and development	Per 1,000 employees	On research and development per 1,000 employees
Iron and Steel	413,000	5.5	13	3,771	938	9	2.3
Construction (building)	630,000	1.5	2.4	5,441	339	9	0.5
Machine tools*	42,000	3.0	72	550 (Approx.)	120	13	2.9
Chemicals	343,000	39.7	116	15,725	6,111	46	18
Electronic Apparatus	274,000	49.9	182	7,484	4,685	27	17
Aircraft	278,000	140.6	507	7,615	4,365	27	16
Total All private industry		368 (157 from Defence Depts.)		85,000 (8,850 on military projects)	31,000		
National total for weapons development, Military, etc.		246 (Govt. Defence Depts.)		21,350	10,500		
Government Total		385					

* Figures taken from "The Machine Tool Industry", Stationery Office, 1960.

93,000 is stated as the total employed by the Machine Tool Industry in the N.E.D.C. publication *The Growth of the Economy* (March, 1964). With this figure as the basis of calculation some of the measures of technological support for this industry would be considerably lower than as presented above.

Compiled or calculated from data presented in *Annual Report of the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy 1961-62* especially Table VI Stationery Office, Jan. 1963. *Scientific and Technological Manpower in Gt. Britain 1962* especially Table IV Stationery Office, Oct. 1963.

In the post-war years one important reason for the relatively high level of research has been the establishment of the National Health Service. This brought a large and guaranteed market for medical preparations. No doubt confidence in this market was responsible for the £10 million spent last year on pharmaceutical research.

The other "science-based" industries listed are those concerned in the manufacture of electronic apparatus and aircraft. No one would dispute that production here must be closely geared with sustained research. However, there is one reason only why they absorb such a large proportion of the nation's research and development resources. For the development of military aircraft, guided missiles and the like, these industries received the bulk of the £157 million given out of government funds in 1962 for war research in private industry. In the same year these industries also employed three-quarters of the 8,850 scientists and engineers working in private industry on military projects. In the aircraft industry and the electronics industry two-fifths and one-half respectively of all personnel engaged on research and development were on military projects.[5]

The Table shows moreover that where we include those in the Armed Forces and directly employed by government departments the total of qualified scientists and engineers involved in "defence" was about 21,000 in 1962. About half these were engaged in research.

These are not novel observations. There has been much the same distribution of the nation's expenditure on research and development for years past. And much the same distribution of scientists and engineers. Nevertheless these facts must be continually restated. Certainly they cannot be ignored when the technical improvement of our industries is under discussion.

The recent reports on the Iron and Steel, Machine Tools and Building Construction industries are restrained in their criticisms. Yet they all recognise the urgent need for an increased level of research.

[5] *Scientific and Technological Manpower in Great Britain, 1962.* Stationery Office, October, 1963.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Taken altogether the increase in money terms that they recommend for the next few years is about £11 million, and one can estimate that the extra recruitment of engineers and scientists they envisage would approach 1,000.[6] If other industries were to subject themselves to the same self-criticism we find in these reports, muted though it is, we can be sure that the national total recommended for increased research expenditure in private industry would be measured in tens of millions of pounds, and the extra numbers of engineers and scientists needed would be some thousands. In fact the T.U.C. has recommended that research spending in Britain should be increased by £100 million a year.[7]

How to Pay for the Research

The Tories insist, and quite properly, that when policies are advanced involving great expenditure of public money then one has a right to know where this is to come from. For their part Communists must continue to insist that if we are sincere and serious in our desire to see Britain's industries operating in the near future with the most advanced techniques then the most obvious and perhaps the only way in which they can obtain *quickly* the necessary funds (or workshop and laboratory facilities) is by diversion from military research. We can also see employed on the development and manufacture of weapons the only reserve of scientists and engineers which could speedily be made available to man the many new posts in production and research that modernisation demands. The machine tool industry at least recognises that the need to develop is too urgent to allow biding time until suitably qualified people may be recruited from the Universities and Colleges of Advanced Technology.

In the 1960 report on this industry there is a point of particular interest for the present discussion. It stresses the need for the development of electronic control systems and recognises that much more basic research on machine tools themselves will be required so that they may be adapted for coupling with such controls. Close co-operation between the machine tools and electronic apparatus industries will be essential. This research is seen in the report as, at best, of long term commercial value and a recommendation was made that such research, financed from public funds, should be running at a figure of £1 million p.a. by 1964. This would mean the employment of about 100 qualified personnel. It is a welcome beginning. Progress in this field is in fact crucial for the introduction of automation in the machine making industries. But it gives us also a measure of the low priority given to the advancement of productive technology when we contrast this recommendation with the deployment of resources in military research. If there were any serious concern that Britain should not be left behind in the scientific and industrial revolution then the liberation of scientists and laboratory facilities certainly in the electronics industry from their present application predominantly to weapon development would be seen as essential.

Of course the tone of recent official reports is not set by so ambitious an objective as the initiation of Britain into an era of scientific and industrial revolution. Nor is it to be expected that committees sponsored by a Tory government would recommend any diversion of scientific manpower or research resources from military objectives. Failure to do this, however, is to prejudice seriously the chance of attaining much more modest targets for industrial advance, for instance catching up with what the "efficient" capitalist nations have accomplished in the last ten years. Over the period 1953-55 to 1959-61 Germany and Japan respectively recorded increases in manufacturing output of 54 per cent and 148 per cent (compare Britain's 20 per cent increase over these years).[8]

No doubt there are a number of reasons for this, including a high level of United States investment there. But it is not just coincidence that in these countries of high growth rate which compete with increasing effectiveness in traditional British markets there has been a relatively small re-armament programme. And it has been of further help to the vitality of their industries that accumulated capital has been largely re-invested in modernisation.

In contrast a continuing source of weakness in British manufacturing industry extending over many decades has been the export of capital which could have been invested here in technical improvement. And the rearmament programme of the last fifteen years (now costing close to £2,000 million p.a., 8 per cent of the gross national product) which has served this imperialist policy and anti-communist objectives has had an enormous debilitating effect. These far exceeded the drain of funds for the development of weapons. However, I have preferred above to restrict comment to what can be immediately appreciated as a waste of research resources and highly trained manpower on rearmament; since with an improved political climate, in fact with a policy of peaceful coexistence, these could be quickly mobilised for constructive purposes.

[6] *Research in the Iron and Steel Industry*, Stationery Office, 1963; *The Machine Tool Industry*, Stationery Office, 1960; *Building Research and Information Services*, Stationery Office, 1964.

[7] T.U.C. Conference on Industrial Research and Development and Economic Growth, October, 1963.

[8] *Export Trends*, N.E.D.C. Report (1963).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

War, Profits and Research

It cannot be denied that military research has its socially beneficial by-products.

But what a sad commentary on the way we progress that we should be able to see so many examples of scientific and technological advance originating in research for war. And for the useful by-products of this research what a fantastic price we are obliged to pay.

The squandering of research resources in the cold war can be documented in fair detail. There are other wastages of research potential perennial in capitalist society for which no satisfactory quantitative estimate can be made. Yet no one concerned to see research effort making the fullest contribution to industrial and social advance can overlook them. There is the wastage for instance which comes as a result of economic competition. Consider the following example.

One kind of anaemia occurs because iron is poorly absorbed through the intestine into the blood. A great deal of research has been devoted to discovering iron-containing compounds which may be used to penetrate this blockage. Such compounds have indeed been synthesised in the laboratory in recent years, but it is proving difficult to produce one on a scale sufficient to supply the many people suffering from this anaemia. (To scale up in this way from the laboratory discovery to the industrial process is a common enough problem.) There is no question that this is the sort of research that deserves whole-hearted support. However, there are in Britain at least two pharmaceutical companies each separately attempting to solve this problem. Each employ a whole team of research workers on this same project, and a great deal of their work must be along the same lines. But there is no exchange of ideas permitted, no co-operation of any kind; because the aim of this research is not in the first place the solution of an important medical problem. The production of commodities to be sold for profit is the motive for manufacture and research under capitalism. In fact what matters to the directors of the companies backing this research is that their firm should be first on the market with the drug.

One of the regrettable consequences of this secrecy surrounding industrial research (not of course confined to the pharmaceutical industry), is that it makes it impossible for the Co-operative Research Associations to carry out their proper function. A survey in the Manchester area has made this evident.[9]

> "As the investigation proceeded it became in fact clear that a very large number of firms looked upon the research associations chiefly as trouble-shooters and information bureaux for themselves, and did not see them as establishments mainly devoted to research and development activities likely to be of value to the industry as a whole. . . . At times firms discussed their long term projects with their research associations, but the investigators were left with the impression that many firms appeared to fear that, by discussing such matters, they would reveal the lines upon which their new developments were moving and that these might unwittingly be passed on to competitors who were also members of the same association."

Yet all science, pure and applied, thrives on a continuous exchange of results obtained, techniques devised, ideas through the scientific journals, organised meetings and personal contacts. Indeed a major problem we face today is how to facilitate such intercourse; so at least it seems to scientists not influenced by commercial considerations.

The efficient exchange and dissemination of information still presents problems under socialism but these become only technical and administrative. One of the great strengths of socialism is that scientific and technical co-operation can be at a far higher level with the disappearance of the profit motive and the economic competition that follows it. A recent D.S.I.R. delegation to the Soviet Union makes this clear in their comments on the function of the Sovnarkhoz (Regional Councils of National Economy):[10]

> "Another important part of their work is to send lists of technical suggestions to the firms in their regions and for the firms to report back to the Sovnarkhoz as to whether these suggestions will be applied or not. On receiving a Sovnarkhoz list of suggestions, a firm can write to another firm, referring to the fact that the Sovnarkhoz list states that this other firm has employed a certain method, and the first firm can demand full particulars and drawings so as to instal the method in their own plant. A prerequisite of this system is, of course, a complete lack of private enterprise and competition."

These conditions have also made possible in the Soviet Union a close co-operation between industry and institutes of higher education for research and for teaching. Many in Britain responsible for graduate and post-graduate teaching in technology see the desirability of such co-operation. Student morale would benefit from closer contacts with industry; research in the universities and C.A.T.s would be stimulated by the problems of industry; and these problems would in many cases be more satisfactorily studied in an atmosphere where there is a concern also with fundamental science. Efforts

[9] *Industry and Science*, Manchester University Press, 1954, pp. 62-63.

[10] *Scientific and Technical Information in the Soviet Union*. Report of the D.S.I.R. Delegation to Moscow and Leningrad, 7th-24th June, 1963. D.S.I.R., 1964.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to achieve this closer union deserve our full support, though enough has been said to show that in our society the difficulties in the way of whole-hearted co-operation are formidable. Nor would closer liaison of this kind be sufficient by itself to bring about a proper balance between fundamental and applied research. This does not yet exist and the reasons become plain when we look again at the example of the pharmaceuticals industry.

Competition

The fierce competition prevailing in the market makes the research itself into a scramble to find new drugs. Hundreds of different compounds are synthesised in the hope (there is little basis yet for rational expectation) that screening tests will discover a few that are of medical value, and without damaging side-effects. £10 million was spent in this way last year by the pharmaceutical industry. (Incidentally £7 million was spent on advertising products.)[11]

It is a grossly inefficient way of searching for new medicines, and it will be the only way until we insist that fundamental studies in the biological and medical sciences are given adequate support. The industry itself does not of course undertake such studies; but they are essential before the process of developing new drugs can itself become a science. The Medical Research Council is the body principally responsible for the kind of research that will provide the knowledge we need. Unfortunately it does not make profits for anybody, and so in the present year to cover virtually all aspects of medical research going on in Britain ranging from molecular biology to clinical studies it receives £6,900,000 from the Exchequer.[12]

Criticism in the preceding paragraphs has been concerned in part with some of the inefficiencies of research carried out under the pressure of capitalist competition. But inefficiency is not the only consequence. The pursuit of profit can only be successful when manufactured goods are sold, and sales promotion becomes as important as any other aspect of economic activity under capitalism. This is reflected in the £500 million spent last year on advertising in Britain; a figure exceeding the total spent on research by industry. And it has a direct bearing on the present theme. It means that much research in private industry is concerned to make goods superficially attractive, in fact to push sales, but without introducing any substantial improvement. One suspects also that in many firms the research laboratory is primarily a showpiece to persuade prospective customers (including government departments) that products are based on extensive research investigations.

Innovation under Capitalism and Socialism

So far it will be obvious that I have been considering only research and development as these are promoted by the highly trained scientists and engineer working in a well equipped laboratory. Probably today, and for the future, we must expect major advances, for example in industry, to come in this way. The days are gone when a Whitworth or a Bramah single handed could make revolutionary advances in the manufacturing process. Yet the skilled worker on the shop floor can still make a significant contribution, say, to new metal working techniques (and certainly to the improvement of efficiency in the organisation of production). The extent to which a class-conscious worker in capitalist industry will be willing to do this however is clearly restricted. The active trade unionist is a worker with a pride in his skill and an intelligent appreciation of the manufacturing process to which he contributes. He is often in a position to suggest improvements, but he will be reluctant to do so when his experience gives him no guarantee that there will be a net advantage to himself or his fellow workers. I know from a number of workers in engineering industry in Manchester and Sheffield that it can be a most frustrating situation.

By contrast, workers under socialism need feel no misgivings in making their contribution to the advance of industrial technique. In the Soviet Union the institution of the "days and meetings of innovators" shows the extent to which there is the fullest co-operation in this field between manual workers, technologists and management. It is evident that the manual worker's role in industrial development is highly regarded; and the function of these meetings is to encourage the adoption throughout the relevant industry of new ideas and new methods born on the factory floor.[13]

Scientists and Social Change

Only a few of the working scientists and technologists see the necessity for a fundamental criticism of capitalism. Even so, very often they are obliged to see the advances they have made possible selfishly used for the profit of the few. More than that, they are in a position to know the greatly increased benefits science could bring if it were placed at the service of the whole community, and

[11] "*Times*" *Supplement* on Pharmacy in Britain, Sept. 2nd, 1963.
Nature, Nov. 2nd., 1963, p. 451.

[12] Annual Report of the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy, 1962-63. Stationery Office, Oct., 1963.

[13] *Technical Information in the U.S.S.R.*, A. S. Melik-Shakhnazarov, M.I.T. Libraries (1961).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if all resources were fully enlisted for that enterprise. Although not prepared to draw radical political conclusions many would in effect subscribe to one or more of the criticisms incorporated above. They might well add to the list; it is not intended of course as an exhaustive or a balanced survey.

But for the most part scientists themselves make their criticisms discreetly and privately. The public voice of scientists as a body is too rarely heard. And we had best acknowledge that scientists themselves in post-war years have done little that could stimulate public concern that science should be fully and beneficially employed. Of course there are exceptions to be made, but taking into account the influence scientists and technologists could now exert their actual impact must be accounted slight.

Plain careerism deters many scientists and technologists from showing in any effective way a sense of responsibility for the social implications of their work. But there are other reasons. Scientific work is immensely absorbing and we are fortunate indeed who have the opportunity to make it our profession. However, many become completely immersed in their professional work, virtually forgetting everything else. And a number of scientists go further than this explicitly holding the view that science is too demanding a profession to allow time and energy for other serious interests. The cobbler should stick to his last is the next step.

Nevertheless, on the credit side it must be noted that scientists have spoken out in considerable numbers against the nuclear arms race. It scarcely needs saying that it has been of invaluable help to the whole peace movement that there have been scientists associated with it. Their specialised knowledge has given added authority to the platforms on which they have sat. And as public concern develops from a protest against the evil degradation of science in war and preparations for war to a positive demand for its fullest use in the interests of humanity we can be sure again that the adherence of scientists themselves will be an inestimable advantage. Can we envisage ways in which the scientists themselves might be drawn into such a movement?

The Underdeveloped Nations

C. P. Snow has perhaps given one lead in the concluding section of his lecture *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*.[14] He points to the enormous disparity in the standard of living between the industrially advanced and the underdeveloped nations; and he makes it quite clear that this state of affairs will not long be tolerated.

Snow does not spell out for us the dangers of a passive do-nothing attitude faced with the determination of the under-privileged nations to claim their rightful inheritance. We have had warnings enough at Dien Bien Phu, in Suez, in the Congo, and in Cuba. He is concerned to press for positive action to help these nations; and, although this concerns all of us, Snow clearly anticipates an especially sympathetic response from those with first hand knowledge of science and technology. *They* at least (Snow implies) know that, "it is technically possible to carry out the scientific revolution in India, Africa, South-East Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, within fifty years". They particularly would be acceptable for direct help in the under-developed countries. "They want men who will muck in as colleagues, who will pass on what they know, do an honest technical job, and get out. Fortunately, this is an attitude which comes easily to scientists. They are freer than most people from racial feeling; their own culture is in its human relations a democratic one. In their own internal climate, the breeze of the equality of man hits you in the face, sometimes rather roughly, just as it does in Norway." Snow's lecture is guaranteed fame and not least through the discussion it provoked, though it was disappointing to find the matter of this final section left very much on the fringe of that discussion; for surely Snow's insight is right on the mark that *our* future in this century is to be bound up increasingly with the struggle of the underdeveloped nations for economic and technological transformation. And Snow himself evidently did not want this issue to be left on the perimeter of discussion:

> "Here, in fact, was what I intended to be the centre of the whole argument. Before I wrote the lecture I thought of calling it 'The Rich and the Poor', and I rather wish that I hadn't changed my mind."[15]

In fact the theme *The Two Cultures*, with which the Rede Lecture begins, seems so far to have claimed most attention and often in a rather parochial fashion. Nevertheless, no scientists responding sympathetically to Snow's opening arguments, could then be entirely immune to the concluding appeal to his common sense and good will. And clearly this was Snow's design.

But if the gap between "the Rich and the Poor" is to be closed and we are to have any honourable part in the operation then a great deal more than good will and common sense will be needed. Political commitment will be essential: opposition to imperialist interests and to the assumptions of the cold war.

This is not of course the overt message of Snow's

[14] The Rede Lecture, 1959. Cambridge University Press.

[15] *The Two Cultures: and A Second Look*. Cambridge University Press, 1964. p. 79.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lecture, which, with apparent calculation, avoids mention of specifically *political* issues. Indeed to at least one critic, Lionel Trilling,[16] the lecture communicates "the strongest possible wish that we should forget about politics". For Trilling

> "the real message of the *Two Cultures* is that an understanding between the West and the Soviet Union could be achieved by the culture of scientists, which reaches over factitious national and ideological differences. The field of agreement would be the scientists' common perception of the need for coming together to put the possibilities of the scientific revolution at the disposal of the disadvantaged of all nations."

And there are many scientists in "the west" who would be very willing to be flattered into the mistaken belief that they belong to a community transcending national boundaries that could constitute an effective force for betterment in the world untainted by what they regard as the squalid struggles of national and international politics. But as soon as we proceed from the generalisations of "the Rich and the Poor" and "the scientific revolution" to examine actual cases of underdeveloped nations attempting to get themselves on the road of social and economic progress then we find we cannot avoid politics.

Imperialism and Scientific Advance

Ten years ago Egypt was just beginning to stand up as a truly independent nation under a leadership determined to break decisively with the misery and the backwardness of the past. The key to Egypt's advance was to be the harnessing of her greatest natural asset, the river Nile, to extend the area of irrigated land, and to obtain hydro-electric power as the basis for industrialisation. She was willing to accept help from any quarter. It came in fact from the Soviet Union, in the form of finance and direct technical assistance. The first stage of the High Dam at Aswan now stands completed, a testament to the enterprise and skill of Soviet engineers and technicians. But the point is that the talent of the Soviet engineers and the necessary funds could be placed at the disposal of Egypt in this way because the Soviet Government wholeheartedly desired to see an Egypt economically and technologically independent.

It would have been quite feasible (at least technically and economically) for help to have come from Britain. But in the event whilst the Aswan Dam stands as a monument to the goodwill of the Soviet Union towards a renascent Arab world, Britain, for the present, is chiefly known there as the nation leading the attack on Egyptian independence at Suez. To the Arabs this was seen, with good reason, as an attempt to hold back their social progress.

Imperialism can thrive only as a predator on technologically and economically backward nations. And as long as imperialism remains a dominant element in the economic and political life of Britain then her contribution towards closing the gap between the Rich and the Poor will remain at best half-hearted.

Moreover it is an amalgam of imperialist and anti-communist interests on a world scale that is primarily responsible for the cold war, and with it the diversion into continuous rearmament of enormous economic resources of the industrially advanced nations. With the successful achievement of peaceful coexistence here are the resources which could be made available as help to the underdeveloped world.

One may reasonably anticipate increasing political commitment in this direction as it becomes appreciated that what must be done to aid the underdeveloped countries is also going to be essential for our own economic well-being.

The relatively few advanced industrial nations devote no small part of their manufacturing capacity to producing for the restricted market they themselves comprise. As far as the capitalist nations are concerned this involves competition, each attempting to gain a greater share of the market. In the long run this cannot make economic sense. Meanwhile the enormous potential markets of the underdeveloped world are being neglected. The reasons for this neglect are obvious enough. Until the underdeveloped countries begin to make substantial economic progress how can they buy from us what they require to make that progress? However, there is one way out of that dilemma which would be of benefit to both parties. If we were able to make long term loans with low or deferred interest payments then the many underdeveloped countries could begin to get their economies off the ground, buying engineering and chemical manufactures from the industrially advanced nations.

The "Brain Drain"

So far in recent years scientists in Britain have shown open concern principally over their own working conditions. A minority but increasing in number are demonstrating their dissatisfaction with their salaries and research facilities by migrating to the United States. And there is a further attraction in that direction. The scientist joining the brain drain knows he is going to the centre of exciting developments. With the great research resources now mobilised there (a process accelerated in response to the implications of the launching of the first Sputnik in 1957) the pace of development in

[16] *Universities Quarterly*, December 17th, 1962, p. 22.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many branches of science is now set in the United States (at least for "the west"). Varying degrees of complacency and despair have marked official reactions here to this migration. "It doesn't matter where a scientist carries out his research. The results are published in journals, of world-wide circulation, and so made accessible to all interested." This has been one line. It reveals an ignorance of the environment in which research is carried out. The lively scientist makes an impact on the whole laboratory in which he works; and when we lose a gifted scientist our loss is not only that of an individual talent but also a beneficial influence on a whole group of colleagues.

Moreover this line plainly ignores the consideration that many of those joining the brain drain are teachers-cum-research workers, that we are losing the educators of the coming generation of scientists, technologists and school science teachers. And this is happening at a time when there is considerable doubt whether sufficient staff can be recruited to our Institutes of Higher Education to cope with the plans for expansion in student numbers.

But there is another reaction more difficult to contend with. Approximately the same proportion of our gross national product is devoted to research as in the United States;[17] but since the gross national product of the United States is about eight times that of Britain their total research activity is greater by the same factor. In these circumstances will not the United States always be a magnet for our scientific and engineering talent? A society which trumpets the virtues of the private enterprise system must expect that many scientists will seek the best conditions the world market will offer for their services.

How then can we hope to compete? There could be a way; through an appeal to the scientists' sense of patriotism. But such an appeal will only be effective when we have in operation in Britain a policy for science which serves primarily the interests of the whole people. And it will be reinforced if the social and economic policies with which it is integrated allow Britain to make her fullest contribution in spreading the benefits of science to the whole of mankind.

New Scientific Revolution

Harold Wilson has lost no opportunity to advertise the promise that under his leadership high on the list of priorities for a Labour Government would be the introduction of measures designed to put Britain in the vanguard of the new scientific and industrial revolution. Wilson's healthy exasperation with a society which makes so little use of its great potential of scientific ability is evident, and so is his concern to bring about a society in which productive talent rather than financial cunning will be rewarded. And one imagines that this particular appeal for political support will receive a positive response, not least among scientists and technologists. *Yet the leaders of the Labour Party have little to say of the radical social and economic changes that will be needed if the scientific revolution is to be carried through, and if we are all to enjoy its benefits.* That, we are left to assume, would be an inevitable result.

We need not doubt that we are on the threshold of technical advances which could guarantee abundance for all. There are novel elements in the present situation which fully justify the assertion that we are moving into a period of a new scientific and industrial revolution. We are all well accustomed to machines that substitute for human muscle power and manual dexterity, but now control and calculating devices are taking over aspects of work in the manufacturing process and in office routine for which our eyes and our brains were once essential. Indeed the mechanical or electronic device employed usually is a great deal more reliable and very much faster at its set task than we would be. And this development (though perhaps an especially dramatic and publicised example) is symptomatic of a more general change, towards a technology that increasingly is consciously based on the most advanced science.

Automation under Capitalism

But although these changes carry the potential for a great increase in industrial productivity, under capitalism, history warns us, the fruits will *not* fall automatically to the whole community. By the beginning of this century refinements in the machining of materials (especially of metals) had made it possible for the unskilled assembler to replace the skilled fitter, and the road was open to the assembly line and mass production techniques. The result was a tremendous advance in productivity in a number of industries. However, a general improvement in the standard of living was *not* the most evident immediate effect. Large sections of the population in the industrially advanced nations now enjoy the benefit of this earlier revolution in production. But before this measure of social progress was achieved mass unemployment, war, fascism in some countries, had to be endured; and these also were some of the consequences we must attribute to improvements in industrial technique when these are introduced within capitalist society, unrestricted in its profit seeking operations.

We have been told that the capitalism history

[17] Stevan Dedijer, *New Scientist*, February 20th, 1964.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

describes no longer exists. And we are invited to believe that it is now able to monitor and control its own development, so that the social upheaval which has hitherto accompanied revolutionary advance in industrial technique can be avoided. It is suggested in fact that capitalism of its own volition is now able and willing to introduce automation techniques in such a manner that hardship is avoided, that all may immediately enjoy the benefits of increased production and leisure. Yet even amongst those who clearly prefer to see the continuation of the private enterprise system there are a few objective enough to acknowledge that where automation is introduced for the sake of maximising profit (and there can be no other motive under capitalism), then enormous human and social problems must be involved, and honest enough to admit that capitalism has not yet demonstrated its ability nor any serious inclination to cope with them. A critic of this calibre is John Billera, a leading executive of one of America's largest manufacturers of automation machines:

> "We have allowed many entirely misleading and widely broadcast myths about automation to be accepted as fact; and particularly in regard to its effect on the worker.
>
> "The worst of these myths is the belief that automation is not going to eliminate many jobs. Yet the price is written in cold figures for all to read. In the United States, in the three years from 1955 to 1958, while productivity climbed the number of production workers declined from 13,500,000 to 11,900,000.
>
> "The National Planning Association in the United States has made a study showing that the numbers of chronically unemployed rose from about 500,000 in late 1953 to about 2,000,000 in 1960. In one plant automation reduced the work force by half. In the electrical industry output increased 21 per cent between 1953 and 1961 while unemployment declined 10 per cent.
>
> "Another myth that needs to be laid to rest is that those who lose their jobs to automation can be retrained and put into other jobs requiring higher skills and paying more money. Automation must result in a decrease of available jobs, or what advantage would there be in automating?"

Some progress has been made in coping with these problems. "The shorter working week is an outstanding example. It is estimated that as the result of the electricians' union in New York going on a five-hour day, more than 1,000 new jobs will have been made available."[18] Yet unemployment in the United States has increased, today exceeding the 4,000,000 level.

A new scientific and industrial revolution is not in itself a sufficient guarantee of universal well-being. It certainly cannot be a substitute for social revolution; and we delude ourselves if we imagine any such choice is open to us. The major significance of the increasing power of science and technology is that it must make more urgent the demand for a revolutionary change in social structure.

Socialism

Only a socialist revolution will serve. The fantastic potential of the new techniques can only be controlled to give us a maintained increasing national wealth, with the degree of planning of industry and trade that is only possible with the social ownership of national resources. And only in social ownership have we any guarantee that the increased wealth will appear in the form of a general enjoyment of prosperity, rather than luxury, power and privilege for the few. The new scientific revolution can only come to full fruition with the nurturing of all the talent in our people; and again socialism is the only society where the barriers of educational privilege can be completely broken down.

The argument is not that we should put aside any serious concern for the new scientific and industrial revolution until socialism is achieved. There are a number of policies for which we must work now. The expansion of opportunities in education at all levels; the improvement of facilities for research in science and technology, in universities and colleges of technology, and in industry; the expansion of medical research; the extension of public ownership of industry, which could ensure proper technological development: and these are in fact some of the signposts along the road of the new scientific revolution. Such policies deserve and need the wholehearted support of the working class movement.

At the same time let us make certain they are not pursued lending support, in effect to an attempt to infuse new blood into capitalism. British workers are not Luddites. They want to see Britain making the fullest possible use of "the opportunities offered us by the scientific revolution".[19] But it would be a tragic humiliation for the British Labour Movement if its political strength were lent to help in the sort of modernisation which resulted first and foremost in the greater exploitation of British workers and workers of other lands. It is the responsibility of Communists to ensure that the Labour movement campaigns around these issues as part of the fight for socialism. We must keep our priorities right: heading the list must remain the *socialist* revolution.

[18] *The Sunday Times*. September 30th, 1962.

[19] *The New Britain: Labour's Plan Outlined by Harold Wilson*. Penguin Books, 1964.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The First International

James Klugmann

Extracts from a lecture in commemoration of the Foundation of the International Working Men's Association, given at the Finsbury Town Hall on September 6th, 1964.

I. INTRODUCTION

Our Enemy's Enemy

"THERE is a bookseller's shop in High Holborn. It is in every sense an unpretending establishment. An inscription above it calls it the Reformer's Library . . ." I am reading a quotation from a journal called the *Tablet*. I will continue: ". . . these are the headquarters of a society whose behests are obeyed by countless thousands from Moscow to Madrid and in the New World as in the Old, whose disciples have already waged desperate war against one government, and whose proclamations pledge it to wage that war against every government . . . the ominous, the ubiquitous International Association of Workmen."[1]

The date of the journal is July 15th, 1871.

The First International was indeed a spectre haunting the ruling classes of Europe. They feared it and they hated it. When the first conspiracy of silence proved unavailing it was followed by a conspiracy of calumny.

The International's agents were seen everywhere, behind every strike, discontent, rebellion, war. Bourgeois police and prosecutors published fantastic figures of its membership.

In the Third Trial of the French Empire against members of the Central Committee of the French Section of the International, on June 8th, 1870, the Public Prosecutor declared that the International had 811,513 members of which 433,785 were in France, 45,000 in Switzerland, 150,000 in Germany, 100,000 in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, 80,000 in England and 2,728 in Spain.[2]

The Times in all its modesty, at the same period estimated the membership at 2,500,000.[3]

The agents of the International, it was proclaimed, were possessed of vast hoards of gold and banknotes. In London alone, reported the German General Friedrich von Bernhardi "on reliable authority", the International had amassed £5 million sterling.[4] Everywhere alien agents with sinister sources of shekels plotted the downfall of . . . capitalist . . . society.

The facts of the case, alas, were rather different. The International could be counted in hundreds *and* thousands rather than hundreds *of* thousands, and as for its cash resources—with an annual individual subscription of a shilling and an annual trade union affiliation fee of 3d. per year per member—later reduced, and this often unpaid—these were infinitesimal.

When Engels gave the financial report for the General Council to The Hague Congress of 1872,[5] the International was in debt to the extent of £25 to members of the Council and others. Members of the Council, said Marx, "emptied their pockets and their purses for the organisation"[5] yet the bourgeois press continued to report that the leadership of the General Council were wallowing in wealth.

Marx at times felt bitter:

> "The Council in its published report to the Congress of Basle (1869) ridicules the huge treasure with which the busy tongue of the European police and the wild imagination of the capitalist had endowed it. It says: 'If the people, though good Christians, had happened to live at the time of nascent Christianity, they would have hurried to a Roman bank there to pry into St. Paul's balance'."[6]

Perhaps the point is established. The bourgeoisie of Europe cursed and calumnied the First International because they feared and hated it. They made Marx into a monster, because he was its inspiration.

As that great German socialist August Bebel once said, himself a close associate of the International: "What pleases our enemies is harmful to us."

Lenin was to echo him:

> "The estimate of a shrewd enemy is very rarely based upon sheer misunderstanding; you can tell a man's mistakes by the people who praise him."[7]

You can tell a man's achievements, too, by a shrewd enemy's estimate. The bourgeoisie ceaselessly slandered Marx and the leaders of the First International. Can there be a better measure of their service to the working class?

[1] *Tablet*, July 15th, 1871, quoted by Henry Collins in *The English Branches of the First International*.

[2] Oscar Testut, *L'Association Internationale des Travailleurs*, Lyons 1870.

[3] *The Times*, June 15th, 1871.

[4] Friedrich von Bernhardi—*Tagebuchblätter aus dem Jahre* 1867-69, Leipzig, 1901.

[5] *Minutes of The Hague Congress* edited by Hans Gerth, University of Wisconsin Press, 1958.

[6] Karl Marx—*A Reply on the First International*, August 1878—first printed in English in *Labour Monthly*, September 1954, pp. 417-421.

[7] V. I. Lenin, *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*, February-May 1904.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II. PRECURSORS OF THE INTERNATIONAL

Marxism is itself not a bolt from the blue. Neither an act of God nor of a genius called Marx. It could only develop with the development of the proletariat. It is both the continuation of previous ideas and movements and something qualitatively new that marks a new stage in the international working class movement.

I believe it is the same with the First International. It is a continuation of earlier efforts and strivings of the working class. It could only come at a certain stage of the development of working class organisations. I mean that neither the Communist League in the forties, nor the Fraternal Democratics in the late forties and early fifties, nor the International Association in the fifties, could have performed the function of the International Working Men's Association in the sixties and early seventies.

And when it *did* come, under Marx's leadership, it brought something *qualitatively new* to the International working class movement.

Let us look, therefore, first at what it "continued", what it arose from, and then at its radically new contribution to the working class movement of the world.

If this were a book and not a lecture, in our examination of precursors we should have to look, certainly, at the writings and struggles of Babeuf at the end of the militant period of the French Revolution, and the work of his associate Buonarotti developing secret revolutionary organisations in France in the first half of the nineteenth century—organisations like the *Société Des Familles* and the *Société Des Saisons*.

We should find ourselves examining the organisations of the militant German emigrant workers in Western Europe, particularly in Paris, and their contacts with the French secret societies, looking at their own organisations like the *League of the Just* (1836) which became, as the *Communist League* an international organisation with the watchword of the League "All Men are Brothers", becoming "Workers of the World Unite". Certainly we should have to study the Communist League, in reality, despite its restricted influence, the first revolutionary international working class organisation and particularly its Second Congress in November-December 1847 held in London, attended by Marx, and leading to the drafting by Marx and Engels of the *Communist Manifesto*. But the membership of the Communist League was tiny.

But you will understand if I raise in more detail the question of specifically *British* precursors of conceptions of international solidarity and of international working class co-operation.

It seems to me that there are three great strands of the British Radical and Labour movement in its formative period—trade unionism; the radical, "reform" and democratic movement; utopian socialism—all of which to an extent at first develop rather separately, and all of which in their own way, contributed towards the development of conceptions and practice of international working class and popular solidarity.

Trades Unions

The conception of *solidarity* is at the very heart of the birth of British trade unionism. The only hope of the workers in their struggle for wages and shorter hours was to make use of their numbers, to "come together", to "combine". Almost two hundred years ago the "clasped hands" of brotherhood was adopted again and again as the emblem of the early Friendly Societies. The ruling class tried to ban the "combinations" of the working class.

If you turn to the Home Office documents, the reports of Magistrates and spies, the intercepted letters, the stolen leaflets and posters, the meticulous work of the forerunners of MI5, you will see unending evidence of this sense of solidarity amongst the workers.

The workers, writes Lord Pembroke, to Home Office, at the beginning of the last century

> "were unfortunately true to each other".[8]

James Reed, Chief Magistrate at Bow Street, sent to investigate strikes in Wiltshire, writes in 1802 to Lord Pelham, Home Secretary:

> "The prisoner . . . says he is a member of the Shearmen's Club, and that lately he had been called upon to take an oath . . . to be true to the shearmen, and see that none of them are hurt, and not to divulge any of their secrets."[9]

Anti-combination laws and persecution could only increase the workers' sense of solidarity. Trade union organisation developed bringing together, first, whole trades and then by the 1860's workers of different trades in trades councils. The time was ripe for international solidarity.

Part of this was due, as we have seen in the case of the Communist League, to the movements of emigrant workers. But partly it was borne in on them the hard way by the working of international capitalism.

Every time the employers demanded a reduction of wages they cried aloud "the necessities of foreign competition". In each capitalist country employers gave this *same* reason for wage cuts. What other moral could be drawn than the need for international working class solidarity?

You will find this vividly reflected in an 1817 Resolution drawn up by the Framework Knitters of Leicester.

[8] H.O. 42/66.
[9] Letter of August 9th, 1802, H.O. 42/66.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> ". . . to Reduce the Wage of the Mechanic of this country so low that he cannot live by his labour, in order to undersell Foreign Manufactures in a Foreign market, is to gain one customer abroad, and lose two at home.
>
> ". . . if the Mechanics of this country were to work for nothing, it would not increase our Foreign Trade, as the Governments of other countries must, of necessity, in order to protect their own Manufacturers, raise their duties upon our goods in proportion to the cheapness that we can send them to their markets."[10]

And so, when in the 1850's and 1860's the practice developed amongst European employers of importing foreign workers to break strikes, the need for international working class solidarity and *for some organisation to co-ordinate that solidarity*, arose as a continuation of the whole conception of solidarity that developed from a trade to the trades, from one locality to whole areas, from areas to a nationwide basis, and thence to the working class of the whole world.

Radical Traditions and Utopias

In the same way you could easily trace the development of the British radical democratic traditions of internationalism from the days of Thomas Paine and of the London and other Corresponding Societies in the 1790's, through the radical reform movement of the 1820's and 1830's, to the Fraternal Democrats of the 1840's.

In this tradition you will find the deep opposition to aggressive war.

"What must I say to the French if they come?" wrote the agrarian socialist Thomas Spence in 1799:

> "If they jeeringly ask me what I am fighting for, must I tell them for my country? For my dear country in which I dare not pluck a nut? Would they not laugh at me? Yes, and do you think that I would bear it? No certainly I would not. I would throw down my musket saying let such as is the Duke of Portland, who claims the country, fight for it, for I am but as a stranger and sojourner and have neither part nor lot among them."[11]

In this same tradition you will find the radical and Chartist solidarity with the Irish fight for freedom, the magnificent demonstration in 1850 of the brewery workers of Barclay and Perkins on Bank Side against the butcher of the Hungarian Revolution, General Haynau. A Farringdon Hall meeting to congratulate the Barclay and Perkins workers, addressed by Engels, declared in its resolution:

> ". . . all the peoples of the earth are brothers, the infliction of tyranny and cruelty in any country is an outrage to all nations. . . ."

Then in 1859-60 came support for the struggle for Italian freedom and unity, and, in 1863, great working class rallies of sympathy for the Polish insurrection against Tsarist Russia.

"All men are brothers" was the watchword of the revolutionary democratic movement in Britain from the 1790's. From this the workers took the next step towards the foundation of the International Working Men's Association.

Along another path, you could show how the teachings of the Utopian Socialists like Robert Owen, with their schemes for converting the world into co-operative or socialist "colonies" or communities, designed to unite the whole world all nations and races, into a single and fraternal brotherhood, led too, in the direction of conceptions of international solidarity.

In this sense the First International continued—and *qualitatively* developed—*all* the best internationalist traditions in the British Radical and Labour movement.

Immediate Prelude to the International, 1859-64

The last years of the 1850's and the first years of the sixties were years of rapidly expanding capitalism in Europe, of great increase of the working class both in numbers, organisation and activity. The working class movement generally in Western Europe was recovering from its defeats in the 1848-49 Revolution, and in many different forms, with many different weaknesses, was advancing.

In France, despite legal prohibitions, there were constant strikes in the late 1850's, new unions and friendly societies were formed and in 1863, Paris workers put up candidates for the first time.

In Germany the early 1860's saw a working class revival, the formation of "Workers Educational Societies", and in 1863, on Lassalle's initiative, the establishment of the "General Association of German Workers".[12] In Italy, workers participated in the 1859-60 insurrections which defeated the occupying Austrian forces, and in a whole number of mutual aid societies formed under the inspiration of Mazzini.

Great international struggles like the Italian Liberation and Unification movement, the American Civil War, the Polish Insurrection inspired workers to courageous actions of solidarity in France, Germany, Britain and other lands.

In Britain itself the period of 1859-64 was one of rising activity both on economic and on political and international issues.

The great Building Strike and Lock Out (1859-62) reached a level of open class struggle that had not been seen for many years. Government intervention

[10] H.O. 42/160.

[11] *Restorer of Society to its Natural Stage*, 1799-

[12] *Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiterverein*, founded May 23rd, 1863.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the side of the employers (for instance when the Government at the end of July 1861 sent troops to work at Chelsea Barracks) sharply raised the need for *political* alongside *economic* action.

Benjamin Lucraft, joiner, former Chartist, future member of the General Council of the International, wrote to *Reynolds*, drawing the lesson of the Chelsea affair:

> "I should hope that the Operative Builders are by this time convinced that political power has something to do with the social conditions of the people."[13]

Out of the London building worker's struggle emerged the London Trades Council whose secretary George Odger played an important part in the formation of the International, the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, whose Secretary Robert Applegarth, was the most prominent trade unionist to serve on the General Council, and the journal *Beehive* which for a period became the International's official organ.

British workers, in this period, rallied to the support of the Italian freedom fighters. Their reception for Garibaldi in 1864 alarmed the ruling class. Despite their suffering during the "cotton famine" engendered by the American Civil War, and despite many a ruling class attempt to rally them for support of the slave-owning South, they maintained their support for the North—"a new, brilliant proof", in Marx's words, "of the indestructible excellence of the English popular masses, of that excellence which is the secret of England's greatness."[14] They rallied to the support of the Polish insurrectionaries.

By the beginning of 1864 in a whole number of ways they were showing their militancy on a *political* as well as an *economic* front.

> "Never within our recollection", wrote Robert Hartwell, "have the relations between capital and labour been in so disturbed and agitated a state as at the present time."[15]

This was on May 7th, 1864, and Hartwell, then editor of *Beehive*, by the end of the year was a member of the General Council of the International.

They even, incidentally, challenged the prerogative of the rich to dominate the commemoration of Shakespeare's tercentenary, and insisted on their *own*, working class, celebrations.

So far as the British workers were concerned, the situation was ripe for the formation of the International Working Men's Association, the First International.

The International is Founded

In September 1864, in two successive weekly issues of *Beehive*[16] you could read an *Announcement:*

> "A Public Meeting will be held at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, on Wednesday evening, September 28th, 1864, when a Deputation appointed by the workmen of Paris will deliver their reply to the Address of their English brethren and submit a plan for a better understanding between the two peoples."

The previous year, in fact on June 22nd, 1863, a meeting of British workers in solidarity with the Polish insurrection was attended by a delegation of French workers. The next day the same French delegation was received at the Bell Inn, Old Bailey, by the London Trades Council, with German and Polish workers also present.

Following this encounter, a Committee of British workers drew up and despatched a fraternal message *To the Working Men of France.*

> "As a means . . . to check the existing abuse of power, we echo your call for a fraternity of peoples. Let there be a gathering together of representatives from France, Italy, Germany, Poland, England and all countries, where there exists a will to co-operate for the good of mankind."[17]

It protested at the "cruel war in China", called for a "united effort" for the freedom of Poland, and was signed by a painter, a joiner, a bookbinder, a carpenter, and a shoemaker, including George Odger and William Cremer.

To this meeting, then, at St. Martins Hall, on September 28th, 1864, just one hundred years ago—the French workers brought their answer.

British trade unionists, delegates of French workers and German, Italian and Polish workmen and socialist emigrants living in London attended.

At the end of the meeting a Committee was appointed to carry out its resolution, to form and lead an international association of working men. In this committee of over thirty, the last name quoted in the *Beehive* report was a certain "Dr. Marx."[17]

This Dr. Marx, last on the *Beehive's* list, was to be throughout its history, the guide and inspirer of the First International.

III. THE CONGRESSES OF THE INTERNATIONAL

This is not the place to try and present in detail the history of the International Working Men's Associa-

[13] *Reynolds*, July 28th, 1861.
[14] Karl Marx, "A London Workers Meeting," in *Die Presse*, January 28th, 1862.
[15] *Beehive*, May 7th, 1864, quoted by Royden Harrison in "The British Labour Movement and the International in 1864" (*Socialist Register*, 1964).
[16] *Beehive*, September 17th and 24th, 1864.
[17] Report of International Meeting in St. Martin's Hall, *Beehive* No. 155, October 1st, 1864.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, its organisation, its Conferences and its Congresses, its resolutions, its campaigns, its development and its demise.

Let it suffice here to say that with its leading body, the General Council, working from London, it effectively lasted eight years from the St. Martin's Hall inaugural meeting to The Hague Congress of 1872 which in reality marked its end, though it was to continue formally a few years further working from the United States.

The London Conference (September 1865) was essentially an interim meeting of a few delegates to prepare for the forthcoming Congress of the following year.

The **First Congress, Geneva, September 1866,** demanded legislation for an eight-hour day, restrictions on child and female labour, abolition of the standing army, accepted Marx's draft on the role of the trade unions, declared in favour of the Co-operative movement whilst showing its restricted role within capitalism, and, after heated polemic and discussion with the French delegates under Proudhonist influence rejected all resolutions in opposition to strikes or to working class political action.

The **Second Congress, Lausanne, September 1867,** discussed the question of nationalisation of transport and of the land. The taking over of transport and exchange was approved, but again, in view of Proudhonist opposition, the question of land ownership was held over. A resolution on peace was adopted. The organisation was now spreading to Switzerland, Italy, Belgium.

The **Third Congress, Brussels, September 1868,** continued the debate on common ownership, declared for collective ownership of the land, forest, mines, railways, canals, roads, telegraph and other communications—a big victory for the views of Marx against the supporters of Proudhonist and the various other petty bourgeois socialists, a victory that was underlined by the Congress recommendation that workers should study Marx's *Capital*, the first volumes of which had just appeared. The question of war was again discussed, and general strikes recommended if war should break out.

The **Fourth Congress, September 1869,** called for the formation of trade union congresses in all countries. After heated debate, the common ownership of the land was again accepted.

By now, the defeat of the Proudhonist trend was virtually completed within the International but a new danger of anarchism, Bakuninism, was beginning to arise.

In France, Britain, Germany, Belgium, the sections of the International were still advancing, representatives attended for the first time now from Spain and the United States.

The **Fifth Congress,** that was to have been in Mainz in 1870 was postponed as a result of the Franco-Prussian War. Then came the glorious struggle of the *Paris Commune*, and the ruthless oppression that succeeded it. Congresses for the moment could not be held.

In **September 1871,** a **Conference** was held in **London** on a restricted basis. The battle was joined in earnest with the anarchists. The lessons of the Commune were being assessed and the Conference declared that the formation of a working class political party in each country was essential for the triumph of social revolution and the abolition of classes.

The **Fifth Congress, The Hague, September 1872,** was the last effective congress of the International. Both Marx and Engels attended. The struggle against the anarchists continued. Bakunin and his main associates were expelled. The need for a political party of the working class was reaffirmed.

At the same time, with the oppression all over Europe, following the Paris Commune, the withdrawal of leading English trade unionists, the growth of anarchist influence in various areas, it was decided to transfer the seat of the International from London to New York.

This was, in fact, the beginning of the end, and after a few years of purely American activity, the International was formally dissolved.

Such a list of successive Congresses, of meetings held, of resolutions voted, does not in any sense properly reflect the struggles, achievements of the First International.

These were eight years of successive struggle, eight years of the battle of ideas in which Karl Marx and his closest associates did battle against the ideas of reformism, petty bourgeois socialism, anarchism; eight years of tireless activity to bring about unity of all sections of the working class, to develop militant trade unions, and later independent working class political parties. These were eight years of international working class solidarity, fight against the export of strikebreakers, support for Irish Liberation, struggle against war. These were the years of the Paris Commune in which the members of the International (they were seventeen out of ninety-two) played so honourable a role.

By the end of these eight years, the International had done its work, the principles of class struggle, of the *Communist Manifesto*, the ideas of Marx and Engels, had become familiar to advanced workers in many countries. The scene was set for the development of mass political parties of the working class.

The International ended its work, but its ideas and approaches lived on. Its eight years' activity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had opened a new era in the international working class movement.

Let us look for a moment at the principles which it taught.

IV. THE PRINCIPLES OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

Men and women are not born Marxists or anti-Marxists. Their ideas are in constant flux, under the continuous influence of life, experience, struggle, and of ideas reactionary or progressive that are brought before them.

When we try to estimate the service of Marx and Engels to the First International and the service of the First International to the world's working class movement, we must appreciate not only the scientific socialist ideas that were brought to the Labour movement, but the *method* by which they were brought.

It is not enough to *have* revolutionary ideas, but the problem is *how to bring them to the working class movement.* A revolutionary theory without the mass Labour movement is as sadly incomplete as a mass Labour movement without revolutionary theory.

This is what Marx so well understood, and what, in the course of the eight years of the International, he struggled ceaselessly to achieve was the unity, wedding if you like, of scientific socialist ideas with the mass Labour movement.

"The workers," he wrote in the Inaugural Address, "possess numbers", but, he added:

> ". . . numbers weigh only in the balance, if united by combination and led by knowledge."[18]

Socialist Theory

Step by step in discussion, letter, debate, article, at the General Council or at Congress, directly and indirectly, Marx, aided by Engels and others of his closest associates, brought into the international working class movement of the 1864-72 period the ideas, theories, approaches of scientific socialism.

Not all at once. They did not try to dump lock, stock and barrel into the *Inaugural Address* and the *Provisional Rules* the contents of the *Communist Manifesto* of 1848.

Instead, patiently, step by step, combating petty-bourgeois, reformist, liberal and later anarchist views, Marx and his colleagues, brought into the International and its sections, the essential ideas of socialism. The drafting of the Inaugural Address and of the Provisional Rules was itself a masterly example of how to find a common agreement on deep socialist principles between British trade unionists, French Proudhonists and Blanquists, Italian followers of Mazzini, German followers of Lassalle etc. Just from this point of view alone I would recommend all active Marxists to study and restudy the *Inaugural Address* and the *Rules.*

What were the main socialist ideas that Marx incorporated in these initial documents, won agreement for, and step by step, gained support for in the main sections of the International?

Perhaps the first was the understanding of the leading role of the working class itself, that the working class needs socialism, but that this can only be won by the struggle of the working class, or as he put it, at the beginning of the Rules:

> "*The emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves.*"

This principle, at the time when utopian ideas were still rife, when British workers, including leading members of the International, saw their future still within the capitalist system, when French Proudhonists looked to mutual credit schemes, and German Lassalleans to the measures of the capitalist state for their salvation, was of no mean importance. Later Lenin was to remark that

> "the main thing in the doctrine of Marx is that it brings out the historic role of the proletariat as the builder of socialist society."[19]

A second essential principle, which Marx fought for was the need for the social ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange. The *Provisional Rules* stated:

> "The economical subjection of the mass of labour to the monopoliser of the means of labour, that is the sources of life, lies at the bottom of servitude in all its forms, of all social misery, mental degradation and political dependence."

Again it was a step by step struggle, fought at successive Congresses against those who still believed in degrees of private ownership, particularly (as with the Proudhonists) private ownership of the land. Step by step, support was won for social ownership of transport and means of exchange, mines and lands and forests.

Above all, step by step, at General Council Meetings, Conferences, Congresses, Marx sought to win the understanding of the workers of the need for *political* action, and, eventually, for the winning of political power. "*To* conquer *political* power," he wrote in the Inaugural Address," *has become the great duty of the working class.*"

If it was not possible all at once to win the General Council for *all* that was involved in the gaining of political power, Marx worked to win them, from the beginning for consistent participation in *political* as distinct from *economic* struggles.

In fact this was particularly true of Britain,

[18] *Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association*, written by Marx, October 21st-28th, 1864, published in London, November 1864.

[19] Quoted Gerratana in September 1964 issue of *World Marxist Review.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

where the members of the International played a conspicuous part in the struggle to widen the suffrage. The National Reform League was set up in 1865 under the direct initiative of Marx and the International. Of twelve members of its Executive Committee, six were working class members of the General Council. When the 1867 Reform Act still excluded the majority of British workers from the vote, Marx helped, through the General Council, to promote, in October 1869, the Land and Labour League with universal suffrage on its programme, with John Weston the Owenite manufacturer with whom Marx had debated in 1865 on *Value, Price and Profit* as its Chairman, and with ten General Council members on its Executive.

The Paris Commune it is true frightened away a number of British supporters of the International (though this I believe has been exaggerated), but the lessons were summed up for the International by Marx in classic fashion in the *Civil War in France* and the need to smash the bourgeois state put clearly before the working class of the world.

Working Class Unity

The aim of Marx throughout the life of the International Working Men's Association was to bring the essential principles of socialism not to some small hard core of initiates, not to the already persuaded, but to the *really effective existing* organisations of the Labour movement.

This, as I have said, meant the difficult patient task of combining continuous explanation of these principles in terms that the workers could understand, with ceaseless effort to unite, draw into action, and lead another step forward in understanding, the main working class organisations.

The International, wrote Engels, in the Preface to the English edition of the *Communist Manifesto* was

> "formed with the express aim of welding into one body the whole militant proletariat of Europe and America."

and therefore it

> "could not at once proclaim the principles laid down in the *Manifesto*.
>
> "The International was bound to have a programme broad enough to be acceptable to the English Trade Unions, the followers of Proudhon in France, Belgium, Italy and Spain and to the Lassalleans in Germany.
>
> "Marx, who drew up this programme to the satisfaction of all parties, entirely trusted to the intellectual development of the working class, which was sure to result from combined action and mutual discussion. The very events and vicissitudes of the struggle against capitalism, the defeats even more than the victories, could not help bringing home to men's minds the insufficiency of their various favourite nostrums and preparing the way for a more complete insight into the true conditions of working class emancipation.
>
> "And Marx was right. The International on its breaking up in 1874, left the workers quite different men from what it had found them in 1864."[20]

Or again, in a passage that we could well hang up on the wall as a text for constant reflection, Engels wrote in a letter of 1887:

> "Had we from 1864 to 1873 insisted on working together only with those who openly adopted our platform, where should we be today? . . . I think all our practice has shown that it is possible to work along with the general movement of the working class at every one of its stages without giving up or hiding our own distinct position and even organisation. . . ."[21]

I wonder if our comrades today realise all the complexity of the problems facing Marx in 1864!

In Britain, along with a sprinkling of old Owenites and Chartists, the principal working class force connected with the International were the English trade unionists, including some of the principal leaders of the craft unions, men who were not in any sense revolutionaries, but deeply concerned with the fight on wages, hours, trade union solidarity, democratic reform, but in the main, reform *within* the existing social system.

In France in 1864 the bulk of the workers linked with the International were followers of Proudhon, if you like petty-bourgeois socialists. They looked to a society in which each man would own property and receive the full fruit of his labour either as an individual or as a member of a producers' co-operative. They wanted to receive "free credit" advanced through "people's banks". The "pure" Proudhonists were opposed both to political and economic struggle.

But as Marx well understood, the Proudhonist workers were learning from struggle and could learn from Marxism, and step by step between 1864-69 the grip of Proudhonism on the French workers was broken.

A small group of French workers were followers of Blanqui, himself a disciple of Babeuf and Buonarotti. They, in complete opposition to the Proudhonists, looked to armed revolution, but organised through elite secret conspiratorial societies, cut off from the mass of the people. And, for what appeared like quite opposite reasons, they, too, were opposed to all immediate struggle for reforms.

In Germany, in 1864, the main influence on the German workers linked to the International was that of Lassalle, a contradictory figure. On the one hand, Lassalle, had the great merit of seeing the

[20] Engels—Preface to the English edition of the *Communist Manifesto*, 1888.

[21] Quoted by Ponomaryev in *World Marxist Review*, September 1964.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

need for the *independent* political organisation of the working class, but, on the other, teaching the famous "iron law of wages" (i.e. that the workers could not improve their living conditions through struggle under capitalism, a theory that Marx so fiercely opposed but has always been accused of), flirting with Bismarck and the German landlords (Junkers) he exercised a negative influence on large sections of workers. But again Marx saw the distinction between Lassalle and the mass of the workers that were influenced by Lassalle, and it is to no small extent due to Marx and the influence of the International that, by 1869, the German Social Democratic Workers Party, led by August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht, and based on Marxism, was founded, so that the International had a new and firmer base in Germany.

Immediate Struggles

Marx saw clearly that workers learn, not only through schools and meetings and pamphlets where socialist ideas are propagated, but also through the *experience of the immediate struggle against capitalism.*

And unlike so many of the groupings, sects, societies, from utopians to anarchists, he fully understood the role of the mass organisations of the workers like trade unions that would lead them in *immediate* struggles.

Marx appreciated the role of trade unions, understood that good trade union organisation and consistent struggle *could* win improvement for the working class even within capitalism. If you look at the Minutes of the General Council for June 20th and 27th, 1865, you will find "Citizen Marx" reading a paper in reply to Citizen Weston (the paper that later was to be published as *Value, Price and Profit*) precisely to this effect.[22]

But I would particularly recommend that in this connection you study the *Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council*,[23] drafted by Marx in preparation for the 1866 Geneva Congress, especially the section on *Trades Unions—Their Past, Present and Future.*

The activity of the Unions on wages, hours and other immediate issues, he writes

> "is not only legitimate, it is necessary. It cannot be dispensed with so long as the present system of production lasts. On the contrary, it must be generalised by the formation and the combination of Trade Unions throughout all countries."

But the Unions must go further in the future:

> ". . . they must now learn to act deliberately as organising centres of the working class in the interest of its *complete emancipation.* They must aid every social and political movement tending in that direction."

Again, with the Co-operative movement, both in the *Inaugural Address* and in the *Instructions for Delegates*, Marx saw the strength and the weakness, the possibilities and the limitations. He stressed the "value of these great social experiments" which have "shown that production on a large scale, and in accord with the behest of modern science, may be carried on without the existence of a class of masters employing a class of hands."[24]

But he warned that "if kept within the narrow circle of the casual efforts of private workmen", co-operative labour "will never be able to arrest the growth in geometrical progression of monopoly . . ."[25] and added in the *Instructions for Delegates:*

> "To convert social production into one large and harmonious system of free and co-operative labour, *general social changes* are wanted, *changes of the general conditions of society*, never to be realised save by the transfer of the organised forces of society, viz., the state power, from capitalists and landlords to the producers themselves."[26]

Working Class Party

We have already seen that it was after, and in fact as a result of, the experience of the Paris Commune, that the International, with Marx's aid, put clearly the need for an independent working class political party:

> "In its struggle against the collective power of the possessing classes the proletariat can act as a class only by constituting itself a distinct political party, opposed to all the old parties formed by the possessing classes.
>
> "This constitution of the proletariat into a political party is indispensable to ensure the triumph of the social revolution and of its ultimate goal: the abolition of classes. . . ."

Adopted as a Resolution at the London Conference of 1872, these clauses became part of the official Rules at the Hague Congress the following year.

Proletarian Internationalism

The International Working Men's Association itself arose in the course of international working class solidarity with the Polish Insurrection. Throughout its eight years of effective existence it maintained international working class solidarity,

---

[22] *Minutes of the General Council of the First International*,1864-66, Lawrence & Wishart, 1964, pp. 109-111.
[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 340-351.
[24] *Inaugural Address.*
[25] Ibid.
[26] *Instructions for Delegates* . . . Section 5, *Co-operative Labour.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proletarian internationalism, at the centre of its life.

Against Foreign Strike-breakers

Drafting the *Instructions for Delegates* in 1866 Marx made a point that should never be forgotten. Solidarity must be in *practice* as well as theory, in *deeds* as well as words. It is, he wrote

> "one of the great purposes of the Association to make the workmen of different countries not only feel but act as brethren and comrades in the army of emancipation."

You could fill a book or certainly a lecture with nothing but specific practical examples of how the International between 1865-72 carried out its work of solidarity with strikers and, in particular, carried out its campaigns against the import of foreign workers as strike breakers. In Britain, with the help of British trade unionists, this work was especially effective. I would cite as examples the tailors' strikes in London and Scotland in 1866 and the International's support for the Newcastle engineers' strike of 1871. In the course of this latter strike, which involved some 7,000 engineers in the Newcastle area, and which was fought on the issue of the nine-hour day, the employers tried to import foreign engineers. The Nine-Hour League turned to the International for help, and the International succeeded in persuading the foreign workers, mostly Germans, to return home. Even the Amalgamated Society of Engineering (A.S.E.), which had always opposed affiliation to the International, was obliged to recognise its services in this struggle.[27]

Against Colonialism.

An aspect of the internationalism of the I.W.M.A. especially important for us in Britain, and an aspect in which the British workers were amongst the most active, was the fight against colonialism.

Years before the International was founded, Marx and Engels had been exposing the nature of colonial oppression and exploitation in countries like India and China.

Now they had an opportunity through the medium of the International to raise this issue in *practice* as well as *theory* before the broader organisations of the working class.

The fight against colonialism, in which, under the aegis of the I.W.M.A. the British workers were most actively engaged was solidarity with the people of Ireland—Britain's oldest colony.

In January 1866 the General Council decided to support the appeal for funds for the arrested Fenians, and the appeal was published in its journal the *Workman's Advocate*. It demanded that the British Home Secretary should receive a deputation to protest at the brutal treatment of the prisoners (February 1866) and, on his refusal, published the correspondence.

The revival of the Irish land campaign (1869-70) met with active support of the International, which took the lead in the organisation of a great solidarity demonstration of British and Irish workers from Trafalgar Square to Hyde Park on October 24th, 1869. Already in the course of the solidarity campaign, though the main body of British workers connected with the International were wholehearted in their support, there was already some wavering on the part of certain of the Liberal trade union leaders.

Against War

From the first to the last the International Working Men's Association maintained the fight for peace. Marx worked consistently to persuade the workers to *enter themselves* into the field of foreign policy, not to leave it to the ruling governments.

> ". . . if the emancipation of the working classes requires their fraternal concurrence,"

he wrote in the *Inaugural Address*,

> "how are they to fulfil that great mission with a foreign policy in pursuit of criminal designs, playing upon national prejudices, and squandering in piratical wars the people's blood and treasure."

It is the duty of the working class, he added,

> "*to master themselves the mysteries of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective governments; to counteract them, if necessary by all means in their power.*"

He cited as example the working class of England:

> "It was not the wisdom of the ruling classes, but the heroic resistance to their criminal folly by the working classes of England that saved the West of Europe from plunging into an infamous crusade for the perpetuation and propagation of slavery on the other side of the Atlantic."

The fight for such a foreign policy, he concluded,

> "forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes."

A study of the successive Conferences and Congresses of the I.W.M.A. shows continuous discussion of the struggle against war. At Geneva, in 1866, Congress called for "the right of self-determination in Europe and for the abolition of standing armies". In 1867, at Lausanne, the resolution declared that "the burden of war is borne by the working classes". At Brussels in 1868 the war question was at the centre of discussion (the Franco-Prussian War was brewing) and the Resolution adopted invited

[27] See James Klugmann—"Strike Breakers Defeated" *Comment*, June 20th, 1964.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> "all the sections of the Association in their respective countries, and also all working class societies and all workers' groups of whatever kind, to take the most vigorous action to prevent a war between the peoples."

The Brussels Congress, in fact, called on the working class to strike if war should break out. Marx himself had no confidence in such a formulation, and was always suspicious of highfalutin phrases about opposition to war. He wanted action.

The French and German workers, helped by the International, through their fraternal demonstrations, played an honourable role when the Franco-Prussian War finally broke out, but they were not strong enough to stop its outbreak nor to bring it to a speedy end.

V. THE INTERNATIONAL AND THE BRITISH WORKERS

There is much study still needed of the relation between the International and the British workers and their respective influences on one another.

Marx's Estimate

One thing is certain, Marx never underestimated the importance of the role of the British workers or the importance of winning them for the International.

"We have succeeded," he wrote to Kugelmann in January 1866, "in drawing into the movement the one really big workers' organisation, the English trades unions . . ."[28] Or again, writing to Meyer and Vogt on April 9th, 1870:

> ". . . to hasten the social revolution in England is the most important object of the International Working Men's Association."[29]

Strength of British Support

How great was the support for the I.W.M.A. amongst the British trade unionists? Again there is much work, research, still to be done in this field.

From the first there were friendly relations with the London Trades Council.

The first British trade union to affiliate was the Operative Society of Bricklayers with a membership of 4,000. In March 1865 the Amalgamated Cordwainers (with about 5,000 members) affiliated.

The year 1866 was important for the advance of British support, and the Sheffield Conference of Trades Delegates, a precursor of the T.U.C. (founded two years later) officially recommended that all its supporting unions should join the International.

At the Geneva Congress (September 1866), Cremer could report that the number of affiliated trade unionists in Britain was over 25,000, that the "moral effect of the International Association" was "very great throughout Britain".[30]

A year later, at the Lausanne Congress, over thirty trade unions were reckoned to have affiliated, with a total membership of over 50,000. In all around fifty British trade union affiliations to the I.W.M.A. have been recorded.

Why did British Support Fall?

Why did British support begin to fall? Was it just the effect of the Paris Commune, how far, in any case, were resignations due to support for the Commune by the International? These are questions that deserve much further discussion.

In this connection it is very important to note where, in which industries, British support for the International was strong and where it was weak.

At first the main support was from the building trade[31] reflecting, I think, the great strikes and lock-out of the 1859-62 period. Eleven out of the twenty-seven British members of the General Council in 1864 were building workers.

Affiliated to the I.W.M.A. along with bricklayers and carpenters were shoemakers, tailors, cabinet makers, bookbinders, ribbon weavers, saddlers web weavers, cigar makers etc.

But several points stand out:

(1) There are almost no unskilled workers represented (except for the United Excavators who affiliated when the International joined one of their strikes in 1866).

(2) Support is overwhelmingly from *London*. Only a few provincial Unions affiliated like the Malleable Ironworkers around Darlington and the Ribbon Weavers of Coventry along with a number of societies of shoemakers and tailors.

(3) Above all there is conspicuous *lack of support from heavy industry*. There is no affiliation from the mines. The Amalgamated Society of Engineers (A.S.E.) never affiliated. William Allan, its general secretary, was always opposed to affiliation. Almost no support from the ironworkers except in the case I have mentioned above.

The last important affiliation from British trade unionists was the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners (with its over 9,000 members) in December 1867.

It is interesting[32] that of the famous five-man

---

[28] Marx—*Letter to Dr. Kugelmann*, January 15th, 1866.
[29] Marx & Engels—*Selected Correspondence*, Lawrence & Wishart, p. 290.
[30] *Commonwealth*—September 8th, 1866.
[31] See Henry Collins—"Karl Marx, The International and the British Trade Union Movement", *Science and Society*, Fall, 1962.
[32] Op. cit.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"junta" of the English trade unions of this period Odger (shoemaker), Coulson (bricklayer) and Applegarth (carpenter) were all on the General Council, whilst Allan (engineer) and Guile (ironfounder) were *not*.

There is evidence, though I can only throw out suggestions, without having personally conducted direct research, that British support for the International was falling *before* the Paris Commune.

The liberal influence was again growing stronger. There was already some doubt amongst the most liberal members about support for the Irish in 1869-70.

Certainly the immediate effect of the Commune has been exaggerated. Two British members of the General Council Odger and Lucraft it is true, resigned, refusing to sign the declaration on *Civil War in France*, the statement in defence of the Commune drafted by Marx. But *nineteen* other English members of the General Council did *not* resign. The Birmingham Trades Council, to its honour, went on record in support of the International's stand on the Commune. Both Odger and Lucraft seem to have had other motives for resignation. Lucraft on May 23rd, had assured the General Council of "his entire sympathy" with the Commune.[33]

Certainly, after the defeat of the Commune, the British capitalist press set up such a howl of hate and against both Communards and International, that it would have been hard for a Liberal trade unionist to remain affiliated.

The Federal Council for England

I do not propose here to deal with the final episode of the relations of the British workers with the I.W.M.A.—the formation in September 1871 of a specific British leading Committee—the Federal Council for England. This, interesting though it is, was a symptom of break-up.[34]

The setting up of such a special Council for England had at first been opposed by Marx who had thought that the job could better be done by the General Council itself, established in London.

After the London Conference of 1871, objections were withdrawn, and John Hales became the Secretary of the English Federal Council. Hales himself estimated that by September 1871 the International had some 8,000 paid up affiliated members in Britain[35]—only some six fully affiliated unions with two more—the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners and the Operative Bricklayers, affiliated through their Executives only.

[33] Op. cit.

[34] See Henry Collins—"The English Branches of the International" in *Essays in Labour History*, Macmillan, 1960.

[35] *Eastern Post*, September 30th, 1871.

The First Congress of the English Federal Council was held at Nottingham in July 1872, and, outside London, Manchester, Nottingham, Glasgow, Liverpool, Sunderland, Dundee, Loughborough and Middlesbrough seem to be the most important centres.

Soon a rift developed between the General Council and the English Council who entered into correspondence with the anarchists. The local branches began to become more like socialist propaganda groups campaigning on issues of land ownership and currency reform. When the Second Congress was held in Manchester in June 1873, the Council for England was virtually dead.

Let us spare a word of commemoration, however, for old stalwarts of the English Federation, who, whatever their confusions, kept the flag flying to the end. Amongst them William Harrison Riley, editor of the *International Herald*, the Federation's Organ, who, as Edward Carpenter put it

> "did a great work in their time, bridging over the interval between the old Chartism of '48 and the socialism of the early eighties",[36]

or John Hales about whom George Lansbury wrote in his Autobiography.[37] "Hales taught me about the International and taught me the need of working class solidarity."

VI. CONCLUSIONS

I think that all those who read and study Marx's writings of this period or follow his day-to-day work in the International Working Men's Association will be able to draw the lessons for themselves. Marx fought against opportunism both of the right and of the left; consistently over eight years he worked to bring the essential principles of scientific socialism to the broad Labour movement. But, at the same time, he knew how *to start where the workers start*, lead them forward step by step, work for unity in action between all sections of workers. He never made concessions of principle, but was always ready to meet the workers *as they were* and not as he would have liked them to be.

Organisations are made for men not men for organisations. Different types of organisations correspond to different tasks on different periods of society.

The First International fulfilled its function. It brought the ideas of Marxism right into the heart of the existing Labour movement. And having fulfilled its function as an organisation, it came to an end. But its results, its ideals, its ideas live on. Nothing was the same after it as before it.

[36] Edward Carpenter—*Sketches from Life* (Chapter entitled "A Couple of Communists").

[37] George Lansbury—*My Life*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And today in its direct line of descent we have a Soviet Union advancing from socialism to communism, a socialist third of the world, 40 million members of the Communist Parties, a great national liberation movement in which Marxism is more and more playing a leading influence, the growth of influence of Marxist ideas in the heart of the broad labour and intellectual movement of the world.

This is the real legacy of the First International.

Studying Marx and his work within the First International it does not in any way seem like some work of erudition taking you away from practical and immediate struggles, from the problems of today. For the task that Marx set himself—the spreading of real socialist ideas in the Labour movement, fighting for the understanding of the need for socialist ownership, fighting for the understanding of the nature of the State and the need of the workers to win political power, fighting for peace and international working-class solidarity—all these are so very close to the tasks that we face today.

This aim which he set himself—to work for the bringing together, the wedding if you like of socialist ideas with the broad Labour movement—again is so close to the problems that revolutionaries in Britain face today at this period of General Election. Precisely the role of the Communist Party of Great Britain is to bring socialist ideas, socialist consciousness to the working-class and progressive movement, to help to lead the workers and the people in all their immediate struggles, and to provide a new type of effective revolutionary organisation for the most clear sighted section of the workers.

A hundred years ago a certain "Dr. Marx", last on the *Beehive* list of the General Council, drafted the Inaugural Address and Rules of the I.W.M.A. At the time these were appreciated by only a few. We should perhaps in this connection say a word of tribute to Professor Beesley of University College, London, who chaired this foundation meeting at St. Martin's Hall and later described Marx's *Draft Address and Rules* as

> "probably the most striking and powerful statement of the working man's case as against the middle class that has ever been compressed into a dozen small pages."[38]

But despite the Professor's praise the Inaugural Address had but little press at the time, though as the Professor saw, it has come to be understood by and now inspires many millions of many lands.

A small meeting can herald great changes if it stands for ideas that correspond with the needs of history.

A modest party like the Communist Party of Great Britain, which can truly claim to be the heir of everything that was best in the I.W.M.A., can be decisive in bringing about the events that lead to Socialist Britain.

Discussion contribution on:

The Quest for Happiness

Raymond Southall

I AM not at all sure that in their discussion of "The Quest for Happiness"[1] Jean Feldmar and Jane Winter do not tacitly incline towards a view of the nature of man which undermines their apparent purpose. They are supported in this inclination by Professor Schaff who, as they remark, "reminds us that Marxism originated from concern about the individual and his welfare". They then follow Schaff in claiming that there has been a "theoretical gap" in the development of Marxism between this concern and that for economics and politics which Marxists have been forced by circumstances to concentrate their attentions upon. If this is so, then we should make some effort to close the gap in view of the importance the plight of the individual assumes under modern conditions both in the socialist and non-socialist world.

It seems to me fruitless to pursue this line of argument without some preliminary consideration of the basic presumptions that are being made. To begin with, if I am right in presuming that the claim "that Marxism originated from concern about the individual and his welfare" refers to the early views of Marx, those of about 1844, then this suggestion is misleading. Unless I have gravely misunderstood the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*[2] Marx's view appears there to be that the plight of the individual is fabricated by the process he refers to as "alienation"; man begins to feel his plight to be individual rather than social as a result of his estrangement from other men. This estrangement and the isolation (and hence loneliness) of the individual which it creates is of fundemental importance to the discussions launched by Jean Feldman and Jane Winter. The relevant

[1] *Marxism Today*, September 1964.

[38] *Fortnightly Review*, November 1870.

[2] Lawrence and Wishart, 1959.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fundamental importance to the discussion launched by Jean Feldmar and Jane Winter. The relevant document for considering Marx's early views on the matter is *Private Property and Communism etc.* in the volume already mentioned.

Nature of Man

In this series of notes Marx sets forth, amongst other things, his opinions on the nature of man. It is, he observes, only in social activity that man's "natural existence becomes his human existence"; man, that is, ceases to be merely animal and becomes specifically human only through social activity. And Marx goes on to point out that even in their solitariness men remain social beings:

> ". . . when I am engaged in activity which I can seldom perform in direct community with others . . . I am social, because I am active as man. Not only is the material of my activity given me as a social product (as is even the language in which the thinker is active): my own existence is social activity, and therefore that which I make of myself, I make of myself for society and with the consciousness of myself as a social being.
>
> My general consciousness is only the theoretical shape of that of which the living shape is the real community, the social fabric, although at the present day general consciousness is an abstraction from real life and as such antagonistically confronts it."

Finally, he issues a warning which we would do well to remember in trying to reach some fuller understanding of the plight of the individual: "What is to be avoided above all is the re-establishment of 'Society' as an abstraction *vis-à-vis* the individual. The individual is the social being."

Marxism, then, originated in a rejection of the liberal humanitarian emphasis upon the individual which we find in "The Quest for Happiness". It was rejected because it depends upon a false distinction between the separate individual and the social being such as is explicitly made by Jean Feldmar and Jane Winter when they express misgivings at the thought of any attempt "to make children into social beings before they have fully emerged as separate individuals". The juxtaposition of a "concern about the individual and his welfare" and "politics and economics" is only a more general form of the same distinction. Fundamental to this latter distinction is the belief that politics and economics deal in abstract relations which, because they are abstract, have no specific bearing upon the individual plight. In *The Poverty of Philosophy* (1846-7) Marx pours scorn upon Proudhon for adopting precisely this bastard-Hegelian point of view.[3] Marxism originated not in abstracting the plight of the individual from the study of politics and economics, but in the perception that the content of politics and economics is the concrete relationships of actual men and women; and it is only in such relationships that men and women realise their individuality and come to exist as men and women.

Happiness, fear, anxiety, tragedy, etc., are not, therefore, to be considered as states of mind and feeling of an individual in the liberal humanitarian sense (i.e. as an isolated being) they are qualities of human relationships, relationships made in the pursuit of other ends and for the satisfaction of other needs. These other ends and other needs are those which can be generally described as political and economic. Marxist economics,[4] for instance, reveal how in capitalist society relationships between people take upon themselves the appearance of relationships between people and things and how it is, therefore, that people become emotionally dependent upon things—they hate them, love them, fear them, found their happiness upon them—and feel only obscurely the human relationships that private property represents.[5] Their world is filled

> with a dim and undetermined sense
> Of unknown modes of being

disembodied forces working obscurely to shape their destinies, as Wordsworth felt them to be shaping his. And "The increase in the quantity of objects," Marx remarked, "is accompanied by an extension of the realm of the alien powers to which man is subjected."[6] Their hatred and fear, their happiness, love and anxiety appears to depend upon forces over which man can have no control and which are beyond the scope of human understanding. There then appears to be, as Jean Feldmar and Jane Winter bear witness to, areas of human behaviour which cannot be rationally explained, behaviour motivated by dark irrational forces. And with the growth of affluence (what Marx calls "The increase in the quantity of objects") the dark irrational forces extend their powers.

Capitalism and Frustration

It is not uncommon, as Jean Feldmar and Jane

[3] See Marx's First Observation on The Metaphysics of Political Economy in *The Poverty of Philosophy*, Lawrence and Wishart, 1956.

[4] See Marx on "The Fetishism of Commodities and the Secret thereof" in vol. I, part I of *Capital* and "The Power of Money in Bourgeois Society" in the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*.

[5] Bentham, one of Marx's pet hates, had illustrated this in his *Theory of Fictions* (which I doubt whether Marx had read) by pointing out that men spoke of a right of private property, but that the right of private property was the right of a man to private property (a relationship between a man and a thing) and that this in turn was simply the right of one man to exclude other men from the enjoyment of the thing he owned (i.e. a relationship between people). According to Bentham, when we refer to a right to a thing we are covertly referring to a relationship between people.

[6] *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, p. 115.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

object; the frustrations created by an emotional dependence upon things and the alien, inscrutable forces which surround them will take for the object almost anything which chance throws up—a particular situation, a policy, a person or persons, money, clothes, pets, cars, houses. Of course the passion these things release is irrational; megalomania (over-specialisation) has become a commonplace and more and more people are failing to find a suitable object for their frustrations and are either sinking further and further into the Slough of Despond (or depression, if you like) or are creating fantastic objects, like Harvey in the film, and retreating into a private world of dreams, leading their own secret life of Walter Mitty. One could put the whole matter crudely but succinctly by saying that the dissociation and emotional deterioration associated with schizophrenia is what we actually find Marx describing when he writes of estrangement. And that, similarly, depression and anxiety are symptomatic of a social condition.

The fact that in class society, capitalism particularly, human relationships are continuously frustrated and that men and women are consequently prevented from a satisfactory realisation of their own humanity (sociability) indicates a fruitful area of psychological research. Is it purely accidental, for instance, that at the highest stage of development of class society, when it is already beginning to break down, stress diseases become so widespread.

Self Criticism

To believe that this suffering and deprivation will automatically disappear with the advent of socialism is ridiculous. Immeasurable damage has been done to the emotional life of man throughout the millennia he has lived in class society and it passes to socialism as a legacy of capitalism. Nor are the objective conditions of life under socialism such as to automatically rule out a warping of the emotional life. We hardly need to be reminded that even under socialism emotional immaturity has manifested itself in the elevation of a hero to embody the hopes and achievements of society at large and in the production of scapegoats to embody the fears and failings. Belatedly this has been recognised and there is still a struggle taking place to ensure that people in practice realise that under socialism the responsibility for both success and failure, the centre of our hopes and fears, cannot be delegated. Self-criticism is thus coming to assume its real significance.

Jean Feldmar and Jane Winter suggest that "we should perhaps ask whether the demand for 'self-criticism' places too much emotional stress upon individuals." But it is the very difficulty of practising self-appraisal that makes self-criticism so valuable. To encourage self-criticism is to encourage a man's confidence in himself, to reveal to him the possibility of enhancing his control over his own previously recalcitrant behaviour. You do not create "the sense of mutual confidence" and then proceed to self-criticism; that again implies the false distinction between the individual and the community. How can you have mutual confidence without mutual honesty and mutual frankness? And how can one have this without self-criticism? The practice of self-criticism creates the realisation that one's decisions, actions, successes, failures, are not those of a solitary man, one is not alone in them, one is not deprived of the help and succour of others.

One does not *create* mutuality in this way, one realises it, and that realisation is what produces confidence. Jean Feldmar and Jane Winter betray a misunderstanding of what is implied by "self-criticism" when they write of the "demand" for it. What they then go on to remark shows plainly, I think, that by "demand" they mean "order" or "command". You cannot command people to practice self-criticism, partly for the reasons Jean Feldmar and Jane Winter suggest; but to say that commanding people to practise self-criticism is futile and even damaging is not to say that self-criticism is futile and damaging. We do not need to order people to praise and blame themselves; people do this anyway. What we must do is to ensure that such praise and blame, such assessments as they make of their own efforts and of themselves, are reasonable and sane, positive and forward-looking, that they are aids to future living and not post-mortems.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

October 1964

D. IBARRURI

For Unity of the Communist Movement

R. ARISMENDI

Some Aspects of the Revolutionary Process in Latin America Today

P. FEDOSEYEV

Progress of Natural Science and Contemporary Philosophy

Price 2s. 6d.

From

CENTRAL BOOKS LTD.

37 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Alienation under Socialism

Jack Lindsay

JUDITH COHEN (in *Marxism Today*, June) may well feel puzzled as to what happens to alienation in socialist society; for despite its extreme importance, this is a subject which has hardly been treated by Marxists at all. Yet Marx showed quite clearly what his own attitude was, though he never explicitly dealt with the theme. The primary point is Marx's linking of alienation with division of labour, which in turn is linked with class-division and exploitation. It follows that only with the ending of the division of labour can alienation end, and that means also the ending of all that is born with that division—commodity-production, money, and above all the state.

Two Phases

It follows further that socialism is the phase in which the problem of reversing all the distortions and dehumanisations developed under class society (without losing the gains) is carried out. Communism is the phase when alienation has been ended. The failure to grasp these simple points has made many Marxists take a metaphysical all-or-nothing attitude to the problem: as though the proclamation of socialism must either annihilate alienation once and for all or must carry it on just as it is in class society. Class society cannot do other than increase alienation. Socialism reverses the whole trend and makes possible the annihilation, but it cannot wipe out the whole of past history by a magical gesture.

When one talks of socialist society carrying into itself bourgeois survivals, one is not speaking primarily of individual elements of regression but of the fact that socialism has to tackle the problem of alienation while inheriting the whole mechanism that created it (the state, division of labour, commodity-production). Because it eliminates the key-factor of exploitation, it changes the whole direction and creates a society which is perpetually shedding aspects of alienation as it struggles towards communism. But the idea that the advent of socialism can automatically end alienation gets no support whatever from Marx, and could only be advanced by thinkers who had no idea of what he meant by the term. Indeed, the least acquaintance with Soviet society and its culture would make clear how profound and widespread are still the roots and manifestations of alienation. The idea that a socialist society at once sheds alienation is indeed identical with the Utopian error that one can step straight from capitalism into communism. We might even define socialism as the phase in which alienation is steadily broken down and eliminated.

Division of Labour

That means that socialist society must set before itself the aims of ending the factory system as we know it, of ending the fragmentation and division of labour, commodity production, and the state. To the extent that it achieves these aims, it is ending alienation. The ending of exploitation, moreover, cannot but have a continuous overall effect, enhancing brotherhood without the treacherous contradictions that work in class society, and drawing together all the anti-alienation elements in a grand onward movement.

Against this point we must set the fact that, under certain conditions (e.g. especially of a socialist society environed by imperialist states), there can hardly be other than an intensification of state power and of elements derived from it, which impedes the liberation from the alienating process. At any given moment then the pattern is liable to be complex, working in different ways and at different paces on various individuals and groups (e.g. under Stalin the peasantry could not but be much more backward and alienated than the working class).

Now let us glance back at Marx. He probably ceased using the term alienation because he was tired of addressing a limited audience of neo-Hegelians and of being entangled in their inturned arguments and debates. Turning to the working class as the one great potential revolutionary force, he concentrated on the term "division of labour", which he had already in effect identified with alienation and which the workers could comprehend out of their own experience, without a difficult philosophical training. Thus the continuity between the Marx of 1844-45, who was obsessed with the problems of alienation, and the Marx of *Capital*, lies in the idiom mainly provided by the concept of division of labour, to which *Capital* gives exactly the same meaning as the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. We can trace the process. In the lectures on *Wage, Labour and Capital* (1847), published in 1849, Marx says of the free labourer that he "sells his very self, and that by fractions,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and becomes "transformed into a simple monotonous force of production, with neither physical nor mental elasticity . . . In the same measure in which labour becomes more unsatisfactory, more repulsive, do competition increase and wages decrease". He stresses the "disastrous effects of division of labour".[1] In 1865, in *Wages, Price and Profit*, the term alien forces its way in. The factory-worker is "a mere machine for producing alien wealth, broken in body and brutalised in mind". The same conception appears in *Capital:*

> Since the instruments of labour confront the labourer as independent, economy in their use also appears as a special operation which has nothing to do with him and which is therefore separated from the methods which raise his personal productivity (first vol.).
>
> Finally, as we saw earlier, in actuality the worker treats the social character of his work, its combination with the work of others for a common purpose, as a power alien to him; the instruments necessary to bring this combination into being are alien property to him, to the waste of which he would be quite indifferent if he were not forced to treat them economically (3rd vol.).[2]

The whole analysis of the capitalist system in *Capital* proceeds along these lines. Marx notes how even Adam Smith saw that factory work stunts the worker; it "corrupts the courage of his mind . . . It corrupts even the activity of his body". And he cited D. Urquhart: "To subdivide a man is to execute him, if he deserves the sentence; to assassinate him, if he does not. . . . The subdivision of labour is the assassination of a people." In a footnote he adds, "Hegel held extremely heretical views concerning the division of labour. In his *Rechtsphilosophie*, he writes: "When we speak of educated men, we mean primarily, those who can do anything that others do."[3] Factory life, says Marx, converts the worker "into a cripple, a monster, by forcing him to develop a highly specialised dexterity at the cost of a world of productive impulses and faculties. . . . Not only are the various partial operations allotted to different individuals, but the individual himself is split up, is transferred into the automatic motor of some partial operation". Again he says: "Factory work confiscates every atom of freedom, both in bodily and intellectual activity." He cites the Scottish historian, A. Ferguson: "We make a nation of Helots, and have no free citizens." In such ways he packs into his concept of divided up or fragmented labour his passionate concern about alienation.[4] Engels in *Anti-Duhring* repeats Marx's notion of the narrowing, stultifying, and crippling effects of the division of labour on manual and mental worker alike.[5]

But there is no need to multiply quotations; the point is beyond dispute. Marx is attacking the factory system as such, the factory system as a product of capitalism but as a form which has its inherent disabilities whatever the form of government or of ownership. He saw communism as necessary because it alone, by ending exploitation, allowed the fragmented humanity of the factory-worker to revolt and regain wholeness by ending the division of labour in all its forms (which implied also an ending of the division between country and town).[6] He did not feel the need to discuss transitional forms, in which the state and labour-division were still carried on during the political, economic and cultural struggle that made men into matured Communists (all-round men). But he made his position clear and we must pay him the compliment of assuming that he meant exactly what he said.

Alienation in "Capital"

In *The Critique of the Gotha Programme* he defined the higher phase of communist society as that which comes "after the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labour, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished; after labour has become not only a means of life but life's prime want; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly."[7] Lenin took these words up in *State and Revolution* (published early 1918) and enthusiastically endorsed them.[8] We may then identify the first or lower phase of Marx's communism with what we now call socialism; his higher phase with what we now call communism.

But though the concept of the division of labour

[1] Marx: *Wage, Labour, Capital* (1933) 20, 44f. Note that he had not here yet reached the idea of labour-power: Engels in 1891 intro.

[2] Marx-Engels: *Selected Works* (1935) 439: cf. speech of 1856, and *Capital* (Moore-Aveling) i 357 and iii 102—*Das Kapital* (1957) i 340 and iii 105. For the increase in alienation with class-society's advancing phases, *Marx-Engels Gesamtausgabe* (1927) i 56-9 and *German Ideology* (n.d.) 64-8; *Grundrisse der Kritik der polit. Oekonomie* (1953) 73-82; *Das Kapital* (1957) i 76-89.

[3] Marx: *Capital* (E. and C. Paul, 1933) 353-90; Garaudy, *Humanisme et Marxisme* (1957) 27, 36f, 43.

[4] Marx: *Ibid*, 381; Pappenheim, *The Alienation of Modern Man* (1959) 90.

[5] *Anti-Duhring* (1934) 435f.

[6] Garaudy, 56; Marx, *l.c.*, 371f.

[7] Marx: *Sel. Works*, ii 23. His comments on the Gotha Programme of 1875 were suppressed at the time, but Engels published them in 1891 despite the strong objections of the leadership.

[8] Ch. v, 4; Marx in *Handbook of Marxism*, E. Burns (1936) 751 ff; Lenin, *Sel. Works*, ii.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thus played a key part in Marx's translation of the difficult concept of alienation into everyday language, we cannot limit the carrying on of the concepts solely to this form. The concept, like the Hegelian logic itself, underlies the whole of *Capital*. The more we analyse *Capital's* main ideas, the more we find that they have roots in the *Manuscripts*. Thus, the change from the idea that labour is sold, to the idea that the sold thing is labour power, comes from a thorough working out of the conclusions drawn from alienation. The worker is robbed, not of his labour, a thing, but of his productive or creative force, his innermost self. Similarly, Marx's whole concept of value and surplus value shows a permeation by the alienation concept. It has been well said:

> The possession of money, or that of the instruments of production, of capital in its various forms, makes it possible for the capitalist to buy labour power, which we must not confuse with the productive power of work and the social capacity of production. This labour power is the sole source of value. It is the subject that is alienated in the whole process. This becoming-object of the creative subject is, as Marx explicitly says, the key of the system. "But the way in which one gives surplus value the form of profit by making it pass through the rates of profit is only a continuation of what we have established in the processes of production, *the confusion of subject and object*. . . . We have seen that all the subjective productive forces of work take the shape of productive forces of capital. On one side, value, past labour that dominates present labour, is personified in the capitalist; on the other, the workers appear simply as materialised labour power, as a merchandise.
>
> Alienation thus realised conceals the theory of surplus value.[9]

In *Capital* he carries on the analysis of money made in the *Manuscripts*, cites *Timon of Athens* afresh, and adds a passage from the *Antigone* of Sophocles. He assumes that under communism a man's labour is from the start social labour and that money-capital has *entirely* disappeared. For this reason a man then "has no special product that he has to exchange. His product is not an exchange value". That is, commodity-production has disappeared, as it does not disappear under socialism. "Instead of a division of labour, necessarily ending in an exchange of exchange value, we would have an organisation of labour which results in the participation of the individual in communal consumption." He states further: "If we think of society as not being capitalist, then money-capital disappears entirely and with it therefore the disguises that it carries into transactions. The matter simply becomes that society must calculate beforehand how much labour, how many instruments of production and provisions can be expended, without upset, on branches of activity which, like the building of a railway, will produce neither instruments of production nor food nor any useful effects for a length of time, a year or more, but which will draw away labour, tools and provisions from the total production for the year."

The concept of alienation again appears in that of commodity-fetishism in *Capital*. Marx clearly feels that he can thus show the more complex relations, inner and outer, of alienation without recourse to a philosophical system far beyond the normal reader's range and while keeping within the sphere of political economy, though with a dash of fantasy needed for opening up new vistas. In the *Manuscripts* he had used the analogy of the fetish to define the condition of peoples who had not yet developed a monetary economy and were still dazzled by the sensuous splendour of precious metals.[10] In *Capital* he deepens the concept of the fetish, seeing in the commodity of capitalist production the alienated essence of the producer, which the latter worships as something outside himself, something that incarnates the abstracted money-power, mirroring and yet hiding the social character of the labour that produced it. The relation of the producers to the sum total of their own labours is presented to them as a relation, not between people, but between things.

> To find an analogy we must enter the nebulous world of religion. In that world, the products of the human mind become independent shapes, endowed with lives of their own and able to enter into relations with men and women. The products of the human hand do the same thing in the world of commodities. I speak of this as the *fetishistic character* which attaches itself to the products of labour, as soon as they are produced in the form of commodities. It is inseparable from commodity-production.[11]

Inseparable from commodity-production in itself, we must note, not merely from commodity-production under capitalism. Marx, we have seen, conceived of communism as by its very nature functioning without commodity-production and money-capital. While commodity-production continues, alienation continues, even if, in a socialist society, it is being continually lessened by the struggle for communism.

---

[9] J. Hippolite, *Etudes sur Marx et Hegel* (1955) 164. I have not traced the citation, but for a typical comment on the being and becoming of the product, Marx, *Capital* (Paul) 173. Marx took the key-term, *Verwertung*, surplus-value, from the 1844 MSS. Note that the theme of *Capital* is the "unity of the labour-process with the process of creating surplus-value", *Capital*, 192.

[10] *Econ. and Philosophic MSS of* 1844, M. Milligan (1959) 123.

[11] *Capital* (Paul) 43-58, esp. 45f.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Withering Away of the State

There remains the question of the state, which has been born from the need of organising a society of alienated persons working in a system of labour-division. Marx always defined the state as the result of the division of labour. In his *Critique of the Gotha Programme* he stated that by the term state is meant "the government machine, or the state in so far as it forms a special organism separated from society through the division of labour".[12] Lenin, in *State and Revolution*, developed this definition at length, showing that the state was "the product and the manifestation of the *irreconcilability* of class antagonisms. The state arises when, where, and to the extent that the class antagonisms *cannot* be objectively reconciled. And, conversely, the existence of the state proves that the class antagonisms are irreconcilable".

He cites with approval Engels' statement that "the society that organises production anew on the basis of a free and equal association of the producers will put the whole state machine where it will then belong: in the museum of antiquities, side by side with the spinning-wheel and the bronze axe". And he pours scorn on those who mouth such words only to make a formal obeisance and then to forget them. He goes on to discuss the withering away of the state and the economic base for this withering. He is emphatic: "Where the state exists there is no freedom. Where there is freedom, there will be no state."[13]

It follows from such arguments that the socialist state will only continue to exist while coercive measures are necessary against large sections of the people, while class antagonisms are still strong, or while the society is still far from being "a free and equal association of the producers". We can see that such conclusions were impossible under the later rule of Stalin. The *Kommunist* of October 1961 declared that near the end of the 1930's or in the early 1940's the economic and social conditions of the U.S.S.R. were ripe for the winding up of the dictatorship of the proletariat; but Stalin initiated large-scale persecutions just when a decisive end should have been made to such measures. That is, an important turn in the movement towards the withering away of the state was possible, but was not made. Stalin needed the theory of intensifying class struggle under socialism in order to justify his un-Marxist strengthening of the state. Such a distortion was at least in part made possible by the war situation which was impeding the natural trends of a socialist society. (Marx's picture apparently assumes world communism; certainly it could not reflect a socialist society under the threat of a shattering war attack.)

But to continue the analysis of the problems of alienation in a socialist society would extend this note too far—though a detailed consideration is urgently needed. What I have been concerned with here is to indicate the main lines of Marx's thought that bear on the problem. I should like, however, once more to stress that to point out the existence of alienation in a society like that of the U.S.S.R. does not mean in the least to identify the human condition there with what we find in a capitalist world. The ending of exploitation is the crucial step. While, in the countries where capitalist exploitation exists, the general trend can only be to a worsening of the alienating process, in a socialist land the fundamental trend is to throw off alienation. Every step towards the full socialist stimulation and inspiration of the people, towards the implementing of a polytechnical education, towards the democratic implication of the masses in all forms of political and social activity, towards the raising of the cultural level, and so on, is powerfully loosening the grip of alienation and preparing the ground for a communist world in which that grip is finally broken.

[12] *Sel. Works*, 31.

[13] Lenin cites with special approval Engels' letter to Bebel (March 18th-28th, 1875) ridiculing the idea of a "people's state" and adding that "the 'state' is only a transitional institution which is used in the struggle in the revolution, in order to hold down one's adversaries by force; it is pure nonsense to talk of a 'free people's state'; so long as the proletariat still *uses* the state, it does not use it in the interests of freedom, but in order to hold down its adversaries, and as soon as it becomes possible to speak of freedom, the state as such ceases to exist": see Marx-Engels, *Sel. Corr.* (1942) 336ff.

Please post MARXISM TODAY to me every month.

I enclose (put X in the appropriate box)

☐ **13/6** for **6** months.

☐ **27s.** for one year.

(write in capital letters)

Name .....

Address .....

.....

☞ **POST WITH REMITTANCE to Central Books Ltd., 37 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1**

Published by the Communist Party, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2, and printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ADVANCE ORDERS TAKEN!

During November and early December Collet's will be offering the following new titles which will make excellent Christmas presents.

FROM EMPEROR TO CITIZEN Vol. 1

The Autobiography of Pu Yi, Imperial China's last emperor.
248 pages; actual photographs; hard covers 10s. 6d.

THE ANATOMY OF APARTHEID

by SOLLY SACHS
A very detailed examination by an expert for the student of African affairs.
417 pages; cloth 45s.

RICHARD STRAUSS

The Man and His Work
by ERNST KRAUSE
(trans. from German by John Coombs)
450 pages; illustrations; cloth; 45s.
The author deals with the whole of Strauss' works, making use of new documentary material, letters and diaries.

THE MODERN OLYMPICS STORY

Fascinating anecdotes of some of the most exciting moments of the Olympic Games.
183 pages; 65 photographs; paperback
Ready now 12s. 6d.

From

Collet's

44-45 Museum Street, London, W.C.1

New and forthcoming books

R. Page Arnot

WILLIAM MORRIS, THE MAN & THE MYTH *15s*

A new study of William Morris, Socialist and Communist

Sam Aaronovitch

ECONOMICS FOR TRADE UNIONISTS *5s*

Already a best seller in the factories

W. W. Craik

THE CENTRAL LABOUR COLLEGE 1909-29 *30s*

The story of a great venture in independent working-class education

R. Palme Dutt *36s*

THE INTERNATIONALE

A study of the international socialist movement

Karl Marx

PRE-CAPITALIST ECONOMIC FORMATIONS *25s*

For the first time in English, with an introduction by Eric Hobsbawm

LAWRENCE & WISHART
46 Bedford Row, London, W.C.1

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LENIN

On the Foreign Policy of the Soviet State	7s 6d
Socialism: Petty Bourgeois and Proletarian	3d
Imperialism: the Highest Stage of Capitalism	1s
Marx, Engels, Marxism	6s
What is to be done?	2s
Against Revisionism	6s 6d
Against Liquidationism	5s
Articles and Speeches on Anniversaries of the October Revolution	1s
Problems of Building Socialism and Communism in the USSR	6d
State and Revolution	1s
On Soviet Socialist Democracy	1s 6d

and a complete range of marxist classics

CENTRAL BOOKS
37 Grays Inn Road London WC1

please send for free catalogue

CENTRAL BOOKS
37 Grays Inn Road London WC1

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED